

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.
For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;
the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

The Classical Review

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 15 1951

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Editors { C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W.2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (Chairman)

PROF. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)

F. H. SANDBACH, M.A.

PROF. F. W. WALBANK, M.A.

W. S. WATT, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)

N. G. L. HAMMOND, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society

M. PLATNAUER, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of

PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, University of Adelaide, and
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto

Representing the Council of the
Classical Association

Volume LXIV

DECEMBER 1950

Numbers 3-4

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	81
HESIOD VERSUS PERSES. P. B. R. FORBES	82
SOPHOCLES, ELECTRA 610-11. D. B. GREGOR	87
FLAVUS AGAIN. E. LAUGHTON	88
CATULLUS 4. 6-9. J. A. K. THOMSON	90
A LOCUS VEXATUS IN LUCAN. J. P. D. BOLTON	90
NOTES ON EURIPIDES, LUCRETIVS, AND CLAUDIAN. E. L. B. MEURIG DAVIES	94
ΔΓ' ΟΔΩΝ. D. A. REES	95
EURIPIDES, ELECTRA 726-42. B. H. KEMBALL-COOK	95
THE OLDEST MANUSCRIPT OF JUVENCUS. H. THOMA	95

REVIEWS:

The Wrath of Homer (Mackay), H. L. LORIMER, 96; *Homeric Researches* (Kakridis), W. B. STANFORD, 99; *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Solmsen), P. B. R. FORBES, 100; *Of Irony* (Sedgwick), D. W. LUCAS, 102; *Das Tragische* (Baden), D. W. LUCAS, 103; *Aischylos als Regisseur und Theologe* (Reinhardt), H. J. ROSE, 104; *Notes to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus* (Fletcher), H. J. ROSE, 105; *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Jaeger), W. HAMILTON, 106; *The Philosophy of Anaxagoras* (Cleve), J. E. RAVEN, 108; *Pythagoreans and Eleatics* (Raven), J. TATE, 109; *Spel bij Plato* (de Vries), J. TATE, 111; *Platon et la recherche mathématique de son temps* (Mugler), *Mathematics in Aristotle* (Heath), D. J. ALLAN, 112; *Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics* (Ross), D. A. REES, 114; *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (Festugière), H. J. ROSE, 117; *Prudentius*, I (Thomson), J. H. MOZLEY, 119; *Juste Lipsé et les Annales de Tacite* (Ruysschaert), C. O. BRINK, 120; *Maximini Duo Iuli Capitolini* (Hohl), N. H. BAYNES, 122; *Tertulliani De Anima* (Waszink), G. W. H. LAMPE, 123; *Einführung in die alte Geschichte* (Bengtson), M. CARY, 124; *Might and Right in Antiquity* (Frisch), P. B. R. FORBES, 125; *Studies in Ancient Greek Society* (Thomson), H. J. ROSE, 127; *The History of the Persian Empire* (Olmstead), J. L. MYRES, 129; *Le Miracle Grec* (van den Bruwaene), A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, 131; *Cato Maior* (Marmorale), *Catone Censore* (della Corte), H. H. SCULLARD, 132; *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* (Taylor), G. E. F. CHILVER, 134; *The Lost Province* (Charlesworth), A. R. BURN, 136; *Byzantine Egypt* (Johnson and West), H. I. BELL, 137; *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (Jones), H. ST. L. B. MOSS, 139; *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome* (Alfoldi), C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, 140; *Commemorative Studies in Honor of T. L. Shear*, A. W. LAWRENCE, 142; *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis* (Raubitschek), A. M. WOODWARD, 144; *Corinth*, XV, i (Stillwell), R. M. COOK, 147; *The Folklore of Chios* (Argenti and Rose), W. R. HALLIDAY, 148; *Masterpieces of Greek Coinage* (Seltman), J. G. MILNE, 149; *Verse Translation* (Grierson), T. F. HIGHAM, 151.

SHORT REVIEWS	152
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	163
BOOKS RECEIVED	165
INDEX	168

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 10s. net. Yearly subscription, 16s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.30. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$4.30

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 10s. 6d.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-47) can still be obtained from Messrs. J. W. Arrowsmith, Quay Street, Bristol, for 10s. (for members of the Association, 6s.), and the volume for 1939-45 for 6s. from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply most of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

IMPORTANT

The Classics

VOLUME LXIV, N

The present series ends with
SERIES will begin with the first
for 1951. The volumes of the
to form a sequence with those

Copies of some back number
who wish to complete their sets
tion to the Publisher, stating the

ANT NOTICE

ssical Review

XIV, NUMBERS 3, 4

with this number and a NEW
the first number of the volume
of the New Series will continue
those of the present series.

members are available; subscribers
r sets should make early applica-
ing their requiremen



THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

DECEMBER 1950

NOTES AND NEWS

THE triennial Joint Meeting of the Classical Association, the Hellenic Society, and the Roman Society will be held in Cambridge from 9 to 16 August 1951.

The first International Congress of Classical Studies, organized by the Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques, was held in Paris, contemporaneously with the ninth Congress of Historical Studies, in the week beginning 28 August. A very full programme (too full, some thought) had been arranged on the lines indicated in an earlier note (lxiv. 1): a series of *rapports* surveyed progress and possibilities in selected fields of scholarship, and these were followed by shorter communications dealing with particular problems and enterprises within them. A printed report of the proceedings will be published in due course. British representation, among the speakers and among the hearers, was regrettably small. It is intended that the next Congress should be held in 1954 in Copenhagen.

One function of the Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques, to whose meetings representatives are sent by the constituent societies, is the making of recommendations to Unesco for the use of the funds (unfortunately very limited) which are at its disposal for the subvention of works of scholarship. Among the publications which have received subsidies by this channel are the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, *L'Année Philologique*, *Fasti Archaeologici*, the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, and the *J.H.S.*

The *Archiv für griechische Lexikographie*, directed by Professor Bruno Snell of Hamburg, which was mentioned in C.R. lxii. 98, has changed its title to *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Its collections will not be printed as a whole, but will be maintained in slip

form for consultation by scholars and used for the publication of lexica for particular authors. The publishing house of Teubner has agreed to provide at cost price 100 or 120 sets of sheets of all the Greek texts which it prints or reprints. The promoters of the *Thesaurus* would be grateful if other publishers of Greek texts would extend the same favour, which will save both time and expense in the production of this instrument of scholarship.

Preliminary work for the Homer Lexicon is already well advanced. 'Rechtlinien und Probeartikel für ein Lexikon zu Homer, Hesiod und dem älteren Epos' has been prepared for the guidance of collaborators, and the material is ready to be sent to them. Further offers of assistance will be welcome, and scholars who are interested and willing to collaborate in this work, or in the Lexicon to Hippocrates which is to follow it, are invited to communicate with Professor Snell (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, Seminar für klassische Philologie, Bornplatz 2^{II}, Hamburg 13).

On 30 September 1949 Mr. E. Lobel communicated to the British Academy a paper entitled 'A Greek Historical Drama', dealing with some previously unpublished papyrus fragments. This paper, containing the text of the fragments and a short introduction, has now been separately published by the Oxford University Press. The fragments raise interesting problems; for, meagre as they are, they make it clear that the play had for its theme the usurpation by Gyges of the throne of Lydia, and metrical and linguistic considerations both suggest that it was pre-Sophoclean, and probably pre-Aeschylean. Some modifications may be needed in accepted ideas about the scope of Attic drama.

A correspondent writes: 'This year marks the centenary of the birth of

Dr. Jane Harrison, one of the most famous of women Hellenists, and it is hoped to celebrate the occasion by some volume dedicated to her memory. She was a discoverer, a real pioneer. Her *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* were exactly what they set out to be. They gave to the student about to embark on the subject of Greek Religion just the guidance without which he would be sure to go astray. Almost all previous books on Greek Religion had been misled by the overpoweringly strong influence of the purely literary classic tradition, with its clear-cut anthropomorphic Olympians and its immense array of poets. Miss Harrison based herself on the evidence of archaeology and the records of ancient cults, all of which she interpreted with sympathetic historical imagination. Her second book, *Themis*, brought in fresh light from anthropological parallels to illustrate the movements of the simple tribal mind on which the foundations of Greek religion were laid, and to explain such ideas as *θέμις*, *δίκη*, *νόμος*, *ἄγος*, and the like. She was a most inspiring teacher and colleague, and many scholars, among them F. M. Cornford and Gilbert Murray, have testified to the immense debt they owed to her."

We are asked to announce that it is proposed to commemorate the work of G. M. Columba (1840-1947), Professor of Ancient History in the University of Palermo, and that a committee has been formed in Sicily for that purpose and has published a memoir of Columba by Professor Biagio Pace of the University of Rome, with a bibliography of Columba's writings. It is intended that the memorial should take the form of the republication of some of the rarer works of scholarship on the history of Ancient Sicily. Subscriptions are being received by Professor Bruno Lavagnini of the University of Palermo.

A new quarterly journal of Ancient History, *Historia*, has made its appearance, published in Baden-Baden under the direction of an international committee and the editorship of Dr. Gerold Walser and Dr. Karl Stroheker. The annual subscription is DM. 40. The first number contains articles on 'The Reform of the Roman Constitution in 367/6 B.C.' (K. von Fritz), 'The Date and Meaning of the Vettius Affair' (L. R. Taylor), and 'Christliche Geschichtsapologetik in der Krisis des römischen Reiches' (J. Straub), and reports on 'État actuel de la question constantinienne, 1939/49' (A. Piganiol), 'Neue Ausgrabungen in Russland' (A. Monheim), and 'Die neue Germanicus-Inschrift von Magliano' (H. Nesselhauf): there are also reviews and notes. Subscribers will receive as a *Sonderheft* a classified bibliography of work on Ancient History published in the years 1940-9.

We have received the first number of the *Philosophical Quarterly*, the new journal, edited by Professor T. M. Knox of St. Andrews, which the Scots Philosophical Club has inaugurated in its jubilee year: the annual subscription price is £1. The policy of the journal is to publish work of high academic standard, contributed from any part of the world, in any branch of philosophy; the present composition of the editorial committee, the Professors of Philosophy in the four Scottish Universities, is a guarantee that Ancient Philosophy will not receive less than its proper place. Two items in the first issue are of particular interest to classical readers—an article on 'The Platonic Choice of Lives', by Professor A. S. Ferguson, and the first part of a survey, by Mr. D. J. Allan, of work on Greek Philosophy (from Thales to Cicero) published in the years 1945-9.

HESIOD *versus* PERSES

THE aim of this paper is to examine the features of one part of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, viz. 1-285, which, as

a member of an articulated body, none the less has a certain character of its own.

Who would want the matter of the inheritance adjudicated? No land (the title to which it might be very important even for the possessor to establish) is here in dispute: ἀρπάζων ἐφόρεις, 38, refers to movables, which Perses now possesses. Why should he worry about title unless Hesiod is calling it into question? There is no evidence that Perses has ever sought, or is now seeking, to originate litigation in the matter. *W.D.* 394-7 refers only to begging and δεύτερον . . . ὧδ' ἔρδειν, 34 f., to dallying as a spectator (ὀπιπεύοντα, 29) round the courts, and in 33 f. νείκεα . . . ὀφέλλοις similarly signifies lending increase (by such attendance and, possibly, support) to litigation in which one has no proper pecuniary interest, ἀλλοτρίοις. In Hesiod there is no evidence that the honest man can yet force the wicked man into court. But if the wicked man is, like Perses, in possession, and thinks, like Perses, that by hard swearing he can win the case, he will welcome litigation; he may even challenge the other to seek the court's decision; he will be glad to meet the honest man before the judges and add the colour of legality to his own depredations. So far as we know, neither can force the other into court, but when by common consent, though with opposite motives, both are present in court it is Hesiod, the claimant against the possessor, who corresponds the more closely to the modern plaintiff. *W.D.* 1-285 is a complete rhetorical unit, a forensic speech, representing Hesiod's appeal to the conscience of the people, the princes, and Perses, on the claim which Hesiod is pressing against high-handed expropriation: and in the light of the practice of his day it must be acknowledged as a masterpiece of forensic rhetoric and psychology.

1-10. The scene is the crowded ἀγορά (cf. Hom. *Il.* xviii. 497 ff.) with the magnates in their places and Hesiod and Perses before them. Hesiod, as plaintiff, opens the case with an appeal to the Muses (δοιδῆσιν κλείουσαι: he was a minstrel, as we are to notice again later) to aid him in his invocation of Zeus, who dispenses power and glory—the first of many reminders to the

princes that their power is in the hand of God, their duty is to do his justice, and his eye is upon them; with closer aim Hesiod continues, 'Who makes the crooked straight and withers the haughty', and then, with pointed reference to this trial, and with a solemnity which marks also the opening of Demosthenes' masterpiece, he prays, 'Give heed, to behold and hearken, and do thou make judgement straight with right: I will speak truth to Perses.' (To Perses: for we must not expect modern form from Hesiod—Demosthenes does not address all his remarks to the court.) A litigant who appeals to Zeus does well to hasten with an assurance that he will speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth: that is the connexion between 9 and 10.

11-26. Competition in work, e.g. between trade rivals, is good; not so this kind of strife. Nevertheless, the world being as the divine will has been pleased to make it, men (even the most peaceable) are sometimes compelled to pay tribute to the goddess of litigious strife. Such an opening is common in the Orators: cf. Dem. xlviii (Olympiodorus), 1 and 2, where ἀναγκαῖον and οὐ βουλόμενος and (bis) ἡνάγκασμαι correspond to Hesiod's ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, 15.

27-36. He now turns to Perses. A farmer with plenty of reserves may spend a long time about the courts. But if you miss even one vital task, e.g. sowing, you will lose a whole crop and, having no reserves, you will starve. Lulls in the seasonal round of cultivation are short: So let not the goddess of malicious strife keep your mind from your work, to peer at trials and listen to forensic business. Scant opportunity to heed such has he who has not abundance of corn stored up under his roof. When you have gathered plenty of that, you may foster contentions and strife over other men's goods. But you will have no second chance for this sort of conduct (ὧδ' ἔρδειν). Our dispute shall not entail another such spell of dallying about the courts. I am determined that we shall get a decision here and now—just, I hope, 'by God's own straight ways of right, which are best', and not

by any subterfuges you may have in mind.

37-41. Next, naturally, he states the facts: We made division of the inheritance, and then you carried off much besides—an act calculated to gratify the vanity of these greedy princes who want the honour and profit of judging this case—poor fools, who do not know the virtues of frugality. In spite of the reproach in *δαροφάγους*, 39, the princes are handled rather lightly and circumspectly until 248-69, by which time Hesiod evidently feels the support of the crowd behind him. (We tend to underrate the power of public opinion in early society.)

42-201. With the thought of the frugal life Hesiod opens his argument, not legal but *moral*: for his need is to reform the spirit in Perses and the princes that alone would uphold Perses' depredations, which are just a token of his present passion for easy riches. Hesiod therefore addresses himself to the gospel of righteousness, the only road to good in this hard world; and he begins in the form that his own art and the probable taste of the princes and especially the crowd suggested, i.e. with a story. (Athenian orators sometimes appealed to the same taste; e.g. *Lycurgus in Leocratem*, 83-9; 94-7.) It is the story of Prometheus (with a reminder of the sovereignty of Zeus over man) and Pandora, and the troubles she brought into the world.

'For the earth is full of evil and the sea is full. By night and by day come diseases of their own motion, bringing evil unto mortals, silently, since Zeus the Counsellor hath taken away their voice. So surely may none escape the will of Zeus' (101-5, tr. Mair).

This episode Hesiod relates (at least in the present version of the speech) to the whole story of the Five Ages, so leading to a fuller account of present miseries and the prospect of worse in the culmination of this, the Age of Iron, as it is shown to be. He includes much that may have been common form in such jeremiads; but to that he adds the very evil with which he is now contending: Neither shall there be any favour for *the man of true oath* nor the

just nor the good; rather they shall honour the doer of evils and the man of insolence. 'Right shall lie in might of hand, and Reverence shall be no more: the bad shall wrong the better man, *speaking crooked words and abetting them with an oath*. Envy, brawling, rejoicing in evil, of hateful countenance, shall follow all men to their sorrow. Then verily shall Reverence and Awe veil their fair bodies in white robes and depart from the wide-wayed earth unto Olympus to join the company of the Immortals, forsaking men: but for men that die shall remain but miserable woes: and against evil there shall be no avail' (192-201, tr. Mair; my italics). Even if the full description of the Five Ages was afterwards added by Hesiod to the speech spoken in court, it is clear that in the section now represented by 42-201 his picture of misery and wrong was calculated to move the people to see right done at least that day.

202-12. Hesiod pauses, and having (as I think) fortified himself with popular sympathy, now ventures to accost the princes, though with some caution and indeed a conventional compliment, *φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς*. He tells them a fable of a hawk and a nightingale. In applying *αἰδώς* to the latter he may be throwing back, as perhaps also in 26, a word contemptuously applied to himself by the magnates: in any case the word is absolutely to the point: Unto her he spake masterfully: 'Wretch, wherefore dost thou shriek? Thou art held by one far stronger, and thou shalt go in the way by which I take thee, minstrel though thou art.' The allegory needs no interpretation, and Hesiod at once turns to Perses.

213-24. Don't sin above your station. The great may be a law unto themselves (though even a man of quality cannot easily carry it off with impunity), but the lower orders cannot prosper at all thereby. (They are more dependent on the goodwill of their neighbours, whom such conduct will alienate.) Righteousness pays in the end: so the fool learns by experience; for *Oath runs close after crooked awards of right*, decided by a litigant's false oath: this must be the

meaning of these words addressed to Perses. And let the magnates (*ἀνδρες*, 220) beware of the tumult (cf. Amos iii. 9) of the protesting people. Let the people (*λαοί*, 222) also beware of vengeance: but for the moment Hesiod does not develop this last point.

225-47. He passes first to a picture of the blessings of the righteous community, 225-37; the reverse he reserves effectively for his climax, 238-47. He had stirred the people (1) by the gloomy picture of 100-5, and (2) by the gloomier picture ending at 201; and now he reaches the climax of his appeal to them with what is not far from a curse, a curse of Zeus, terrifying in its realism, should they condone injustice. In an age which believed in curses, if not in blessings, the effect would not be in doubt. The name of Zeus which pervades the whole speech dominates this passage and also the following final appeals to the princes and to Perses.

But whoso ensue evil insolence, and forward works, for them doth Zeus of the far-seeing eyes, the Son of Kronos, decree justice. Yea oftentimes a whole city reapeth the recompense of the evil man, who sinneth and worketh the works of foolishness. On them doth the Son of Kronos bring from Heaven a grievous visitation, even famine and plague together, and the people perish. Their women bear not children: their houses decay by devising of Olympian Zeus: or anon he destroyeth a great host of them within a wall it may be, or the Son of Kronos taketh vengeance on their ships in the sea' (238-47, tr. Mair).

248-73. From them, and probably with their support, he now turns upon the princes. These also he has approached in three stages: (1) in the tacit warning of his opening invocation to Zeus, the dispenser of power, (2) in the fable, and now (3) in this bold admonition:

'O Princes, do ye too consider this vengeance. For the Immortals are nigh among men and remark them that with crooked judgements oppress one another, taking no heed of the anger of the gods. Yea, thrice ten thousand Immortals are there on the bounteous

earth, who keep watch over mortal men: who watch over judgements and forward works: clad in mist, faring everywhere over the earth. Also there is the maiden Justice, the daughter of Zeus, glorious and worshipful among the gods who hold Olympus. And whenever one injureth her with crooked revilings, straightway she sitteth by Zeus the Father the Son of Kronos, and telleth of the unrighteous mind of men, till the people pay for the folly of their kings, who with ill thoughts wrest aside judgements, declaring falsely. Beware of these things, O Kings, and set straight your speech, bribe-devourers, and utterly forget crooked judgements. He deviseth evil for himself who deviseth evil for another, and the evil counsel is worst for him that counselleth' (248 ff., tr. Mair). He ends this passage with a specific reference to this case: The eye of Zeus, which sees and marks all things, now (if it be his will) is looking even upon this that is done here, nor fails he to mark what award of right (straight or crooked) in this case is to be had within this city. Every word of this is calculated to tell, appealing to the conscience of the magnates and, more certainly, to their regard for public opinion, the people having been refreshed with a reminder how they must pay for the misdeeds of the government. The effect must have been visible; for Hesiod allows himself at last an expression of confidence in the result: Now may neither I be righteous among men, nor son of mine, if the less righteous man's plea of right is to prevail. *Nay, I have it in my heart that Zeus the Hurler of the Thunder will not this day bring that yet to pass.* The fact that this line, whether originally used at the trial or not, is included in Hesiod's final published version of the speech is evidence that his cause prevailed: so is the tone of his subsequent advice to Perses.

274-85. The speech closes, as Greek speeches do, in a slightly calmer tone. It is nevertheless the climax of his appeal to Perses, whom also he has approached in three steps, in the exhortation to allow a just trial, by straight ways of right (35 f.), in the plainer hint of God's

vengeance on false swearing (219), and now in this last warning, which more explicitly describes and denounces the device Hesiod fears. 'O Perses, lay thou these things to heart, and listen to right and utterly forget violence.' (Cf. 264 and Hom. *Il.* xxiii. 576.) 'For this rule hath the Son of Kronos appointed unto men, to fishes (cf. Habakkuk i. 14) and beasts and winged birds appointing that they should devour one another, since there is no right among them, but to men he hath given right, which is far the best. For if a man be willing to speak right as he knoweth it to be, to him Zeus of the far-borne voice giveth prosperity' (274 ff.). The man who tells the truth, confessing what he knows to be the rights of the case, plainly and without any screen of foreclosing formality, will prosper. But he who, swearing of his own will in solemn form an oath of confirmation, lies, and thwarting right sins irreparably, will be punished in his posterity: but the race of the man of true oath is better in time to come.

To understand the danger Hesiod feared we must remember the immemorial use of ordeal by oath to decide claims of right or accusations. Thus Menelaus, lodging an objection to Antilochus after a chariot race, says (Hom. *Il.* xxiii. 573 ff.): 'Come, princes . . . lay down a rule of right. . . See, I will myself lay down a rule of right, and none shall find fault, for it shall be straight. Antilochus, come here, and, as the ordinance of custom is, . . . laying your hand on your horses, swear by Poseidon that you did not wilfully with guile (cf. *sciens dolo malo*) obstruct my chariot.' The formalism indicates a regular institutional use of ordeal by oath, and the language of Menelaus is the very language of litigation. The god-fearing Antilochus declined the challenge, knowing, and confessing, his fault; an unscrupulous man would have sworn—would probably have tendered the oath. Thus Autolycus (*Od.* xix. 395 f.) 'excelled all men at thieving and making oath', no doubt with the cunning subtlety of his patron, Hermes, in Hom. *Hym.* iv. 312, 379 ff., who chal-

lenged Apollo to come with him before Zeus, and there offered this oath to decide conclusively Apollo's charge of theft: 'I did not drive the cows to my home, so may I prosper, nor did I cross my threshold. . . And I will swear a great oath upon it.' He had driven them not to his home but elsewhere, and on coming home from the exploit he had not crossed the threshold but had entered (145 ff.) 'sloping through the keyhole of the door like an autumn breeze'.

The way of lawlessness is that of dispossession by force. One of the first duties of progress is to protect the possessor: let the *claimant* prove his right (as the first words of the Gortyn code provide, in a certain type of case). Before the days of proper judicial investigation, the system of ordeal also tends to protect possession; the possessor has the prior right to offer his oath, thereby conclusively deciding the case in his favour, as Antilochus might have done on being challenged, and as Hermes wished to do. So Perses, in possession of the disputed goods, evidently had the right to foreclose all proper investigation of the truth by swearing in effect that his title was valid: if he got the judges to accept that test, to award it as the rule of right to govern the issue, the only trial was upon that judgement, and required only his satisfying that test, which an unscrupulous man would readily do by swearing the oath; the merits would not be considered; the oath would be conclusive (cf. Hebrews vi. 16). All turned on Perses' oath, if he swore it; so the case turns on his conscience. To this, therefore, Hesiod has all along appealed, and now more explicitly he urges him to tell the truth as he knows it to be: in that case Hesiod is sure of the result; but clearly he has been much afraid that Perses may swear a shameless oath, like a Hermes or an Autolycus.

Against the princes the gravamen of Hesiod's charge seems to be not simply that they take bribes, but that their whole system of adjudication is crooked. In the administration of justice ordeal by oath had long outlived any value it

might once have had (as also in England, in debt and detainee, it endured till 1833, the last case being in 1824); Hesiod is not only afraid that Perses will swear a false oath; he is indignant, as the plaintiff in *King v. Williams* probably felt, with the system that permitted such frustration of right. The next step in progress was to get the issue cleared of the oath, a task partly achieved at Gortyn, and even better at Athens, where witnesses were unsworn (except in the antiquated ritual of homicide cases), and judicial investigation preceded judgement.

The exact relation of what we have in *W.D.* 1-285 to the words actually used at the trial can scarcely be determined, and is of minor moment; what is of vital importance is the forensic form in which this part of the poem is drawn. Its ethical character fitted it for expansion into a longer didactic work; but at 286 the tone changes. There is

no longer any of the desperate anxiety about the issue of a trial; instead of the simple vocative, ὦ Πέρση, we have at 286 μέγα νήπιε Πέρση, and for some time similar elaborations of the vocative are used; in 396 Perses is yet unconverted, but Hesiod is no longer the litigant; he speaks calmly, though not less earnestly, as the teacher. The transition is skilfully made. Before embarking on detailed rules of honesty (here 320 is a link with 38 and 126, but the passion is gone), other sacred social duties, thrift, and the seasons for works, Hesiod prefixes a short exordium on the value of at least being able to profit by the wisdom of others; and this he carefully links with the first part by 286-92, harking back to 17-26, to the gospel of work, to which he had briefly alluded in opening his speech, as he reports it, in *Hesiod v. Perses*.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

SOPHOCLES *ELECTRA* 610-II

ὁρῶ μένος πνέουσιν· εἰ δὲ σὺν δίκῃ
ξύνεστι, τοῦδε φροντὶδ' οὐκέτ' εἰσορῶ.

To whom is the Chorus referring? The following answers have been given: Kaibel and Bayfield (1933): πνέουσιν refers to Electra, and ξύνεστι to Clytemnestra; Wecklein conversely; Jebb: both refer to Electra. I suggest that both refer to Clytemnestra, for the following reasons:

i. A change of subject is (*pace* Bayfield) un-Sophoclean and unnecessary.

ii. That the ξύνεστι-clause refers to Clytemnestra is *probable* from the fact that it is she who picks up the word φροντὶδα. Thus Electra likewise, five lines farther on, picks up Clytemnestra's αἰσχύνῃς (615) and again in 624 her λέγειν of 623.

iii. Why should not the Chorus make a remark about Clytemnestra's condition at the end of Electra's speech? The two parts of their remark form a single idea, viz. 'Clytemnestra has so far lost her temper as a result of your speech that she no longer cares about justify-

ing her actions. Therefore (the implication is), do be careful, Electra.' Such a warning is fully in accord with the Chorus's tender care for Electra as manifested throughout the play. (If it is really felt that there ought to be some second-person pronoun to indicate that the remark is addressed *to* (not *about*) Electra, we may accept Blaydes's emendation σοὶ δίκῃ.)

iv. The reference to δίκῃ is rather unexpected, until we notice that in fact Electra's speech is designed to prove to Clytemnestra that Justice is not on her side. The root δικ occurs in it three times (560, 561, 583) and νόμος twice (579, 580). In this she is but replying in kind to Clytemnestra, who likewise uses δίκῃ three times (521, 528, 538), once even personifying it. This alone suggests that Electra's speech was not a passionate utterance but a calm statement, in which only the note of bitterness increases. On Clytemnestra, however, its very calmness would have an infuriating effect.

v. Since the reference is to loss of

temper, confirmation can come only from seeing which of the two does in fact lose her temper. This is obviously Clytemnestra. She is the first to speak, and uses words of great violence, whereas Electra's reply (616-21) is one of her calmest utterances in the play. Clytemnestra then continues with mounting passion, calling Electra *θρέμμ' ἀναίδες*, and vowing with an oath that she will rue her candidness. Electra indeed (as though Sophocles wished to make it quite clear to whom the Chorus had referred) specifically taunts Clytemnestra with not being a good listener and with having grown angry during her speech (628-9). If ever a woman was 'breathing out threatenings and slaughter' against anyone, it was Cly-

temnestra against Electra at that moment.

There was doubtless an established code of gestures whereby masked Greek actors indicated their feelings. The unusual phrase *μένος πνέουσιν* suggests that one of these was the heaving of the bosom to suggest suppressed and mounting rage. This again would exclude Electra, because a speaker's breath is needed for speaking. We may therefore imagine that the actor representing Clytemnestra performed this and other movements, so as to indicate to the Chorus and the audience the Queen's rising anger and Electra's consequent danger.

D. B. GREGOR.

Northampton Grammar School.

FLAVUS AGAIN

SINCE completing my article on *flavus pudor* (C.R. lxii. 109) I have come across a passage which, at first sight, might seem to invalidate the conclusion which I there drew, that there is no evidence for *flavus* being used of the human skin. The passage, which might well have been included by the *Thesaurus* under the category in question, occurs in *Amores* ii. 4, where Ovid is confessing his indiscriminating susceptibility to female charm:

- 39 candida me capiet, capiet me flava puella,
est etiam in fusco grata colore Venus;
seu pendent nivea pulli cervice capilli,
Leda fuit nigra conspicienda coma;
seu flavent, placuit croceis Aurora capillis:
omnibus historiis se meus aptat amor.

It looks as if, in lines 39-40, Ovid is speaking of ladies who in complexion range between *candida* and *fusca*, with *flava* as an intermediate stage. Then in line 41 the poet goes on to speak of different hair-shades, with comparisons from mythology. This is the interpretation given by G. Némethy in his edition of the *Amores*, and if it is correct this is the only instance, so far as I can discover, of *flavus* being used as a simple epithet for a person in a sense other than that of hair-colour.

Némethy suggests that Ovid was influenced by Propertius ii. 25. 41 f:

vidistis pleno teneram candore puellam,
vidistis fuscam,¹ ducit uterque color;

and also by two epigrams of Strato in the Greek Anthology:

xii. 5. 1-2:

Τοὺς λευκοὺς ἀγαπῶ, φιλέω δ' ἅμα τοὺς μελιχρόδεις
καὶ ξανθοὺς, στέργω δ' ἔμπαλι τοὺς μέλανας

xii. 244:

*Ὦν εἶδω τινα λευκὸν ἀπόλλυμαι, ἦν δὲ μελίχρον,
καίνομαι· ἦν ξανθὸν δ' εὐθὺς ὅλος λέλυμαι

The resemblance between Ovid and Propertius is not so striking that it could not be fortuitous, or at most the result of subconscious reminiscence. In the case of the Greek epigrams, however, there seems undoubtedly to be a direct connexion. If they are Strato's own work, and if Strato's *floruit* is correctly placed in the time of Hadrian, our Ovidian passage would seem to have been the model. But it is more probable that Strato was reproducing, or closely imitating, a Hellenistic original, or originals, which served as a model for Ovid also. There is evidence that in later Greek *ξανθός* was sometimes used of the human skin (see L.S.⁹ s.v.). All

¹ Müller's emendation is supported by Butler and Barber. The MSS. reading *fuscus* gives a *recherché* contrast between *plenus candor* and *fuscus candor* (a violent oxymoron). In either case the sense of the couplet remains materially the same.

this might lead one to conclude that here (and here only) Ovid is using *flava* in imitation of this Hellenistic meaning of *ξανθός*.

But if we look at the epigrams more closely, it becomes very doubtful whether *ξανθός* is in fact being applied to the skin. The first epigram might suggest that *ξανθός* is being used as a synonym for *μελιχρώδεις*, but in the second it is clear that there is a marked difference intended between *μελίχρουν* and *ξανθόν*. Is this a difference in skin-colour, and are we to imagine *two* stages between fair skin and dark? I find this hard to believe. Ordinarily there was not even one stage; the skin was either light or dark (see *Anth. Pal.* xii. 165; Propert. loc. cit.; Catull. 93; Cic. *Phil.* ii. 41; Phaedr. iii. 15. 10). *μελίχρουν* is a euphemism for *μέλας* or *μελάγχρουν* (cf. Lucr. iv. 1160 *nigra melichrus est*), just as *fuscus* is a polite equivalent for *niger* (Ovid *Ars Am.* ii. 657, *Rem. Am.* 327). In the first epigram, if we punctuate after *μελιχρώδεις* and supply a verb with *ξανθός*, which is not difficult, we get two pairs of adjectives, the first pair of the skin, and the second pair correspondingly of the hair. One might translate: 'I love them white-skinned and at the same time I love them honey-brown; I love them fair-haired, too, but all the same I like them black-haired.' This interpretation finds support in the fact that the remaining two lines of the epigram deal with the colour of the eyes, and the poet has thus mentioned the three most prominent physical characteristics. In the second epigram *ξανθόν* could indeed refer to the skin, but the above interpretation of the first suggests that here too the hair is meant. It is no real objection that the three adjectives are not all *in pari materie*. The poet is distinguishing three well-marked types, fair-skinned, dark-skinned, and light-haired. If it be asked why he does not include dark-haired for the sake of symmetry and completeness, the answer might be that he has imposed on himself a limit of two lines, and that, whilst fair skin does not imply fair hair, dark skin does imply dark hair.

Let us look again at the Ovid passage. It is difficult to separate lines 41 ff. from the preceding two lines, of which they seem to give an amplification, rounded off by 44. *Flavent* appears to look back to *flava*, and *pulli* to *fusco*. (For these two words used together as equivalents see Ovid *Ars Am.* iii. 189, 191; Virg. *Georg.* iii. 389; Colum. vii. 2. 4.) This chiasmic pattern is destroyed if *flava* refers to the skin, and *flavent* becomes decidedly harsh. But if the suggested interpretation of the Greek epigrams is right, the meaning of our passage is clear. *Candida* and *flava* represent two distinct types of beauty—fair skin and golden hair. (Compare *Amores* iii. 7. 23: 'bis flava Chlide, ter candida Pitho'; *Marianus frag.*, p. 384 Baehr.: 'diva flava et candida Roma'.)¹ *Fusco colore*, whilst specifically referring to the complexion, implies hair-colouring, and the transition is made easier by the affinity, noted above, between *fuscus* and *pullus*. The examples from mythology concern the hair alone, because the colour-epithets which Ovid found among his heroines of legend referred to the hair, and not to the skin. (For this reason also *candida* is not relevant to the chiasmus.)² I would paraphrase the whole passage thus: 'the mistress of dazzling skin will ensnare me, so will the golden-haired, but I can find delight also in loving a dark girl: if dark locks hang on snowy neck, Leda's black hair was her chief attraction; if they are golden, Aurora's saffron locks were a delight to behold. My love can adapt itself to all types of legendary beauty.'

I believe, then, that Ovid is here using *flava* in its normal sense, a sense which gives intelligible pattern to the whole passage, and with which (*pace* Némethy) the Strato epigrams are not necessarily inconsistent.

ERIC LAUGHTON.

University of Sheffield.

¹ These examples in themselves give strong *a priori* support to the ordinary meaning of *flava* in the present passage.

² *nivea* (41) has no significance except to provide pictorial contrast with *pulvi*. Cf. Ov. *A.A.* iii. 189: 'pulla decent niveas'.

CATULLUS IV. 6-9

et hoc negat minacis Adriatici
negare litus insulas Cycladas
Rhodumque nobilem horridamque Thraciam
Propontida trucemue Ponticum sinum. . . .

THESE lines have been the occasion of much learned discussion, which I do not mean to summarize here, partly because I do not feel myself altogether competent to do so. But I venture to make a suggestion for the consideration of Catullan scholars. I propose to read in line 8

Rhodumque nobilem horridamque Thracia

'famous Rhodes and the Propontis ruffled by the Thracian wind'. Thracia I take to be the ablative of *Thracias* (*Θρακίας*), the NNW. wind blowing over the Sea of Marmora from Thrace.

I do not find the *Thracias* mentioned elsewhere in classical Latin literature, but that is hardly a serious objection in a poem which graecizes so much. The Greek evidence is clear enough. The *Θρακίας* is mentioned with other winds in the fragment called *ἀνέμων θέσεις καὶ προσηγορίαι* from the Aristotelian treatise *περὶ σημείων*. It is also named by Theophrastus, *de signis tempestatum* 2. 10 f. It must be the same wind as the *θρασκίας*, which blows from the same quarter in the same region. Aristotle describes it as *μέσος ἀργέστου καὶ ἀπαρκτίου*, therefore NNW. (*Meteorol.* 363^b29). There are frequent references to the *θρασκίας* in Greek literature, and at least one in Latin, Pliny, *N.H.* ii. 47, 120 'numerosior ratio quattuor his interiecerat, thrascian media regione inter septentrionem et occasum solsti-

tialem . . .'. If Pliny speaks of the *Thrascias*, Catullus might speak of the *Thracias*. The name he would learn in the Propontis itself.

The reader may like to have a summary of the answer I got when I consulted an authority. 'During the summer the air in the Levantine, Aegean and Hellespontine waters is generally calm, but in winter depressions pass from west to east, often deepening on their path. They follow three main tracks, one of which is from the Aegean towards the Sea of Marmora, and so to the Black Sea. Strong winds associated with these depressions blow from the land on the northern quadrants, i.e. from N., NNW., and NW., over the Propontis. The track in which you are interested is followed by depressions in spring and autumn as well as in winter. It is right to say that the prevailing storm-wind of the Propontis comes from the NNW., and, since the climate has not appreciably changed in that part of the world during the last 3,000 years, it must have been the prevailing storm-wind there in the time of Catullus.'

If *Thracia* be accepted, the resulting sense is exactly what we should expect. In Jebb's translation of the *Phaselus* I find

Or famous Rhodes, or, rough with Thracian storms, Propontis.

That is to say, he was really translating *Thracia*, although he prints *Thraciam*. I may be excused for thinking that Jebb would have accepted my emendation.

J. A. K. THOMSON.

A LOCUS VEXATUS IN LUCAN

quid quaeri, Labiene, iubes? an liber in armis
occubuisse velim potius quam regna videre?
an sit vita nihil sed longa an differat aetas?

(Lucan ix. 566-8)

CATO has arrived at the oracle of Ammon, and Labienus has asked him to consult it concerning the outcome of the civil war. Cato replies, in a speech replete with Stoicism, that there is an innate knowledge which will enable a man to answer, without the aid of oracles, any

question that he is justified in asking; and the questions which Labienus has raised do not interest him. These are the first three lines of his reply.

I have given 568 as it stands in the manuscripts, and in the text of Housman, who was so unconvinced by any of the many emendations which have been proposed that he preferred to leave the nonsense undisturbed. It is perhaps foolhardy to flout an oracle greater than

that of Ammon: but I intend here to plead the case of a proposal which has received less attention than I believe it to deserve—the proposal to read *sit* for *sed*.

This solution was long ago suggested by Waddel.¹ H. Ammann in *T.L.L.* (v. 1079. 19) mentions the conjecture as a possibility, without naming its author. Modern editors of Lucan give it short shrift: Hosius does not consider it worth specifying; nor does Housman, who must include it under his general dismissal of 'leves ac futtiles hominum circa verba ac litteras haerentium coniecturae'. I hope to show here that, if dismissed it must be, its dismissal should at least be a more gentle one.

Much of Housman's note is devoted to a summary of the observations of Madvig on this line,² and to give the gist of these will make a convenient starting-point. The questions, then, that Cato asks here are those which a Stoic would consider important; and the Stoics had already provided answers to them. Now *vita* *nihil esse* was not a Stoic tenet; and anyway the rest of this sentence is incomprehensible. However, 'nihil interesse, longa an brevis sit vita' was a Stoic tenet; the word *longa* finds a place in the line, and *an nihil differat* clearly cohere. To complete the construction and the sense *brevis* is required. Madvig therefore proposed 'an, sit vita brevis, nil, longane, differat, aetas?'

Apart from the objection already made by Housman to this reconstruction—that either *vita* or *aetas* is superfluous—how could this have undergone the prodigious change into that which the manuscripts offer us? Surely the fact that the text as it stands is nonsense indicates that we have here to deal with a corruption and not with an interpolation. Interpolators try to make sense (or what they think is sense) out of nonsense (or what they think is nonsense); they do not create palpable nonsense themselves. The true reading, then, will not be very far removed from the false. This consideration appears to

me to tell heavily against Madvig's proposal (and even more against Bentley's 'seu sit curta, nihil, seu longa, an referat, aetas').

Now at 576 the body of scholia c (*Commenta Bernensia*, ed. Usener) summarize Cato's speech as follows: 'scire debemus moriendum potius quam serviendum; nihil esse quod vivimus, nihil interesse quam diu vivamus; bono nocere nihil posse, honestum prosperis non augeri, fortunam virtuti nocere non posse; laudanda velle sufficere etsi non fueris consecutus'. The other big body of scholia, a (*Adnotationes super Lucanum*), reproduce this note on 576 practically word for word, though in a defective form (which Endt in his edition has failed to realize, printing it thus: 'quae sunt illa, quae licet scire? moriendum potius quam serviendum, nihil esse quod vivimus, nihil posse honestum, prosperis non augeri, fortunam virtuti nocere non posse, sufficere laudanda voluisse, etsi non fueris consecutus').³

These scholia are in fact copies of another, belonging to a commentary (hereafter called *Z* for convenience), of which some at least underlies, or was incorporated into, both a and c. It embraced matter as late as the eighth or ninth century, if Ussani is correct in thinking that the ascription to Seneca of the first seven lines of Lucan's poem is to be dated then;⁴ and at least as early as the fourth, for the same scholar⁵ argues that the note on iv. 100 *absorpsit* in c (reproduced by a, and so taken

³ The words *nihil posse honestum* are possible Latin but impossible Stoicism, and correspond to nothing in Cato's speech. What has happened is clear enough: a copyist wrote the *nihil* after *vivimus*, and on returning to his exemplar continued with the word following the *nihil* after *nocere*, namely, *posse*: a simple case of omission through haplography. An exact parallel occurs at iii. 658: 'si viscere permixtus legimus, scilicet cum viscere; si viscera permixtus, id est permixta viscera habens' c; 'si viscere . . . , si viscera permixtus, id est permixta viscera habens' a. These two passages prove that c cannot have taken its common matter from a. That the reverse is not the case is shown by the evidence quoted in n. 5, below.

⁴ *Rivista di Filologia*, xxxi (1903), 463 ff. Cf. c and a ad B.C. i. 1.

⁵ In *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, xi (1903), 51.

¹ See Oudendorp, ad loc.

² *Adversaria Critica*, ii. 132-3.

from Σ) is to be dated in the fourth century. It may be even earlier. To the same date, and perhaps the same hand, I would assign the common note on viii. 756.¹ Early, too, appear to be those on iii. 227 ('Mallos urbs Ciliciae sive regio, quae nunc Antiochia nominatur' a), iv. 285 and viii. 195. (The omissions to which reference is made above (p. 91, note 3) either occurred when Σ was incorporated into a common ancestor of CWUGP—the principal manuscripts in which the *Adnotationes* are comprised—or were already present in the exemplar from which this ancestor was copied; but though in these places we can correct a by means of c, and though at iv. 177 in a the scholium (from Σ) and the lemma are at variance,² it must not be assumed that c's version of Σ is always the truer one, or the progenitor of a's, which sometimes preserves information missing in the other.³ The chronological limits thus suggested are very broad; but I feel confident that the note on ix. 576 belongs to the early stratum of Σ , on the ground of its language, which is good classical Latin.⁴)

Σ 's note was written on a text which was clear and meaningful. It gave 568 as composed of two members: (i) *vitam nihil esse*; (ii) *nihil interesse quam diu vivamus*. Both are expressions of orthodox Stoic doctrine, if we understand *nihil* in (i) to mean, not 'nothing at all', or 'an illusion', but 'of no moment', as it does at Pers. i. 122 'hoc ridere meum, tam nil'; Mart. vii. 88. 9 'non nihil ergo sumus'; Stat. *Theb.* xi. 467 (Pietas speaks) 'nil iam ego per populos, nus-

quam reverentia nostri'⁵ (cf. conversely the use of *esse aliquid*, e.g. Cic. *T.D.* v. 104 'an quicquam stultius quam, quos singulos contemnas, eos aliquid putare esse universos?'; Juv. i. 74).

In other words, (i) life itself (*vita*, life qualitatively), and (ii) length of life (*aetas*, life quantitatively)⁶ are *ἀδιάφορα*. That these were commonplaces of Stoicism will be seen from the following passages (where they are also to be found in von Arnim's *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. I add the volume and page in brackets):

(i) Stob. *Ecl.* ii. p. 57. 18 (Wachsmuth) (i. 47) ταῦτ' εἶναι φησιν ὁ Ζήνων ὅσα οὐσίας μετέχει, τῶν δ' ὄντων τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ, τὰ δὲ κακὰ, τὰ δὲ ἀδιάφορα . . . ἀδιάφορα δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα. ζῶν θάνατον κτλ. Sen. *Epp.* 99. 12 'vita nec bonum nec malum est; boni ac mali locus est'; Arr. *Epict. Diss.* ii. 19. 13 (iii. 218); Diog. Laert. vii. 102 (iii. 28); vii. 189 (iii. 172).

(ii) Cic. *Fin.* iii. 46 'Stoicis non videtur optabilior nec magis expetenda beata vita, si sit longa, quam si brevis'; Sen. *Epp.* 93. 2 'non ut diu vivamus curandum est, sed ut satis' (cf. 49. 10; 73. 13). Cf. Plut. *comm. not.* 8 (iii. 13 f.): οὐ μόνον οὖν ταῦτα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες [i.e. the Stoics], ἀλλὰ κακεῖνα πρὸς τοῖτοις, ὅτι ἀγαθὸν ὁ χρόνος οὐκ αὖξει προσγιγνώμενος, ἀλλὰ κὰν ἀκαρὲς τις ὥρας γένηται φρόνιμος, οὐδεὶν πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν ἀπολειφθήσεται τοῦ τὸν αἰῶνα χρωμένου τῇ ἀρετῇ.

The line, then, when restored, must contain both these ideas; and the substitution of *sit* for *sed* seems the simplest solution. The change would not be difficult (*sit*—*set*—*sed*),⁷ aided, as I am

¹ Contrast the passages of Servius and Martianus Capella with those of Priscian adduced by Usener, ad loc.

² 'hospitis ille ciet nomen, vocat ille propinquum.' *Propinquum* MG; *propinqui* ZPUVc: 'VOCAT ILLE PROPINQUUM ἀπὸ κοινοῦ "nomen" accipimus' a.

³ e.g. at viii. 756 and ix. 710. At iii. 237 a and c complement each other. From a comparison with the scholium (also from Σ) on v. 517, and Isid. *Or.* xvii. 7. 57–8 I believe the words of a 'Agroetes significatur Indiae ulterioris populi, qui cannarum viridum caudicibus tunsis sive tritis dicuntur exprimere sucos' to be from Σ .

⁴ I have not been able to see W. Rinkefeil's dissertation (Dresden, 1917) *De adnotationibus super Lucanum*, which is said to treat the relationship of a to c.

⁵ Nutting (*A.J.P.* lii (1931), 49 ff.) holds that *nihil* at Luc. iii. 40 has a similar meaning. I wish I could believe him.

⁶ Cf. Sen. *Epp.* 93. 4 'licet aetas eius imperfecta sit, vita perfecta est'; Plin. *Epp.* v. 14. 5 'quod non tam aetatis maturitate quam vitae merebatur'; Cic. *ad fam.* x. i. 1 'mea vita, cui satisfeci vel aetate vel factis'.

⁷ Cf. Quint. *Inst.* xii. 10. 13 (Radermacher): *sit tamen* bH; *sed tamen* BnBgNEP.

going to suggest it was, by an uncommon use of *differre* by Lucan, which was not understood by the copyists.

The question of punctuation next arises. Waddel proposed

'an sit vita nihil, sit longa? an differat aetas?'

To this there are two objections: (i) by attaching the adjective to *vita* the ideas of quality and quantity, kept distinct by the scholiast, are confused; (ii) the use of *differre* in the sense of 'to matter', with a noun as subject, is, I think, unparalleled.¹ Better would be

'an sit vita nihil? sit longa, an differat, aetas?'

The hyperbaton would be much in Lucan's manner.² *Sit longa aetas* would be a concessive clause—*sit longa aetas, an (id) differat?*: so Cato ap. Aul. Gell. vi. 3. 50 'sint sane superbi, quid id ad vos attinet?'; Cic. *Verr.* II. v. 4. This is more probable than the construction apparently favoured by Ammann,³ that it is a question dependent on *differat*, but bereft of an introductory particle. I say 'apparently favoured', because immediately before this he refers to Lucr. iii. 868 'neque hilum differre ante ullo fuerit iam tempore natus'. Here, however, *ante ullo* is Lachmann's conjecture for *annullo anullo* of O (*anullo anullo* Q); it is unnecessary and unlikely, and is not supported by iv. 1259, to which alone Lachmann appeals.⁴

The gravest difficulty is undoubtedly the meaning which *differre* would have to bear. The impersonal use of the word, in the sense of 'to be different', is not of course unusual; but the practice in this case was to follow it with a disjunctive interrogation, the introductory particle of the first member of which might be omitted (e.g. Auson. i. 2. 3-4 (Peiper) 'sic etiam nostro praefatus habere libro, differat ut nihilo sit

meus anne tuus'). This usage allows easily enough the sense of 'to make a difference' (to employ a convenient colloquialism)—e.g. Plin. *Epp.* ix. 13. 8 'tantum ad fiduciam vel metum differt, nolint homines quod facias an non probent'; thus closely approaching *referre* and *interesse*. But this sense (a sense which the personal use of *differre* could not naturally bear) was not extended to permit the substitution of a subject for the disjunctive interrogation, or the suppression of one of its members, except in the case of Lucr. iii. 868, to which I have already referred (where, however the text is to be restored, the second member of the disjunctive question will have to be understood), and *ad Her.* ii. 20. 33 (Marx) 'item vitiosa expositio est, cum id, quod raro fit, fieri omnino negatur, hoc modo: "nemo potest uno aspectu neque praeteriens in amorem incidere", nam cum nonnemo devenit in amorem uno aspectu, et cum ille neminem dixerit, omnino nihil differt (bIIC (P marg.) B₂; id fertur HB₁ et fort. P₁) raro id fieri, dummodo aliquando fieri aut posse modo fieri intellegatur'. I believe the present passage to be a third example of this rare use of the word. It is noteworthy that in all three passages the text is confused. So far from detracting from their value as parallels I believe that this fact enhances it: for I believe that the confusion in each case is ascribable to the same cause, namely, this unwonted use of *differre*.

But if Lucan meant *referat*, why did he not write it? Perhaps Bentley was right, and he did—some editors emend the *differt* of *ad Her.* ii. 20. 33 to *refert*, and it is remarkable that at Terent. Maur. 165 and 2117 (Keil, *G.L.* vi. 330, 389) the *editio princeps* has *referre* where the sense requires *differre*, which indicates the possibility of confusion between these words; but I rather believe that Lucan was being deliberately bold here, a boldness which he may have felt to be justified by the context. Throughout the speech Cato is expounding Stoic doctrine either directly or by inference: the learned reader should not be surprised, and might be gratified, at this

¹ διαφέρειν in this sense is occasionally used personally, e.g. Plut. *Caes.* 65; Gal. *U.P.* ix. 5; Procl. in *Plat. remp.* ii. 241. 17 (Kroll); and perhaps Eur. *Hec.* 599.

² Housman, *ad loc.*, and Postgate in *C.R.* xxx (1916), 142 ff. give other examples, to which I would add, as having some resemblance to the case under discussion, vi. 652-3 'dubium est, quod traxerit illuc aspiat Stygias an quod descenderit umbras'.

³ Loc. cit.

⁴ See Bailey, *ad loc.*

slight and not altogether unauthorized stretch of a Latin word in reminiscence of a Greek technical term of Stoicism. Latin could render ἀδιάφορον, a term derived from διαφέρειν in the sense of 'to matter', by *indifferens* (Cic.; Sen.): why not use the parent of *indifferens* in the same manner as the parent of ἀδιάφορον, to underline the Stoicism of the context? 'What do you want to know?' asks Cato. 'Whether life itself is of no account? Or, even if length of life be great, whether this, too, is not *indifferens*?'

Exception may be taken to this on the ground that *sit longa, an differat, aetas*? differs fundamentally from the other questions which Cato asks in 566-71, inasmuch as *they* are assertions of Stoic tenets put in an interrogatory form—'liber occumbere velim', 'vita nihil est', etc. ('per totum locum ea est orationis forma, ut per *an* interrogetur de ipso decreto Stoico', Madvig). This objection would be telling, were its force not weakened by its dependence

on the alteration of *ulla* in 569 to *nulla* ('an noceat vis ulla bono?'), against the five chief manuscripts and the lemma of c ('taken from a manuscript which, if it existed entire, would be of importance equal to any', Housman, *Lucan*, p. xiii). If this alteration were upheld, however—and it is very attractive—I should be inclined to venture a conjecture of my own:

nil longa an differat aetas?

The repetition of *nihil* in Σ ('nihil esse quod vivimus, nihil interesse quam diu vivamus') may reflect Lucan's own words. After *nil* had been swallowed by the preceding *nihil* we should have to suppose *sed* to have been inserted by someone who was more concerned to mend the metre than the sense (some notable examples of this process are to be found in Housman's *Manilius*, i, pp. lix ff.).

J. D. P. BOLTON.

*The Queen's College,
Oxford.*

NOTES ON EURIPIDES, LUCRETIUS, AND CLAUDIAN

(1) EURIPIDES, *Electra* 688

παῖσω γὰρ ἦπαρ τοῦμόν ἀμφέκει ξίφεϊ.

γὰρ ἦπαρ Geel: κάρα γὰρ LP. See Denniston; but, though confusion of γ and κ occurs, is κάρα γὰρ for γὰρ ἦπαρ a probable error? κέαρ γάρ Reiske seems a likelier corruption. But is κέαρ used of the heart physically as opposed to emotionally (e.g. *Med.* 398 τοῦμόν ἀλγυνεῖ κέαρ)?

I suggest that κάρα γὰρ is sound, κάρα being loosely used for δέρην. See Dodds at *Bacch.* 241 τράχηλον: he refers to J. E. Powell, *C.R.* liii (1939), 58. Also see A. S. F. Gow, *C.R.* lviii (1944), 38-9, on ὀφρύς: G. P. Shipp, *C.R.* lviii. 52, '... the notorious tendency of terms for parts of the body to become vague in meaning'.

Cf. Philostr. *Sen. Imag.* 2. 30. 2 Εὐάδην γὰρ ἡ γυνὴ ἀποθανεῖν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ὠρμηκεν οὔτε ξίφος τι ἐπὶ τὴν δέρην ἔλκουσα οὔτε βρόχου τινὸς ἐαυτὴν ἀπαρτώσα, οἷα ἡσπάσαντο γυναῖκες ἐπ' ἀνδρά-

σιν. At *Or.* 953 ἀλλ' εὐτρέπιζε φάσγαν' ἡ βρόχον δέρην, possibly both φάσγαν' and βρόχον go with δέρην.

In *Med.* 30 L alone gives κάρα. L's πάλλευκον κάρα may, as Porson suggested, be from *Hec.* 500. Cf. *Or.* 901 'λαοὶ δ' ἐπερρόθησαν BL, cf. *Hec.* 553' (Murray). Otherwise, Euripides here again used κάρα loosely for δέρην: a person or persons who did not understand this use thought πάλλευκον κάρα impossible of the young Medea, and changed it to πάλλευκον δέρην.

On Eur. *El.* 1023 παρηΐδα see Denniston. παρηΐδα, I suggest, is sound, being written loosely for δέρην, as was κάρα in 688.

(2) Lucretius iii. 319-22

illud in his rebus uideo firmare potesse,
usque adeo naturarum uestigia linqui
paruola quae nequeat ratio depellere nobis,
ut nil impediāt dignam dis degere uitam.

321 nobis Lachmann: noctis O: noctes

QV: *dictis* Marullus: *doctis* Lambinus ed. 3. Read *ratio depellere mentis*? Cf. ii. 677 *consimili mentis ratione*; similarly, ii. 381 *animi ratione*, where Bailey compares i. 425, 448, iv. 384. For the corruption cf. iv. 460 *noctis* Q¹: *montis* OQ. Similarly, in Amm. Marc. xxii. 16. 16 for *domis* V *doctis* P. Maas seems likely (coll. xiv. 5. 8 *remora* V for *rector* Henr. Ernst, Bentley: xxii. 16. 14 *hactenus* V for *amoenus* Bentley, C. F. W. Müller, Haupt).

(3) Claudian, *R.P.* i. 171-2

quae scopulos tormenta rotant? quae tanta cauernas
uis glomerat? quo fonte ruit Volcanius amnis?

See W. H. Semple, *C.R.* lx (1946), 63; as he says, *glomerat* here seems to carry the same sense as in Virg. *Aen.* iii. 577. I suggest, however, keeping *cauernas* as 'the contents of the caverns'; so Luc. vi. 294-5 'cum tota cauernas / egerit et torrens in campos defluit Aetna'.

E. L. B. MEURIG DAVIES.

δι' ὧων

M. Antonin. iii. 11. 1 αὐτὸ ὁποῖόν ἐστι κατ' οὐσίαν γυμνὸν ὧων δι' ὧων διηρημένους βλέπειν.

THE words δι' ὧων have caused some trouble to scholars; Menagius suggested δι' ὧων, and Trannoy has more recently obelized the passage. Leopold and Farquharson both rightly retain δι' ὧων, and the latter quotes a parallel from Galen ii. 82 K.: καὶ γὰρ ὅλα δι' ὧων, οὐκ ἔξωθεν μόνον, αὐτὰ διαπλάττει. But this, though apposite, does not by itself bring out the fact that δι' ὧων, 'through and through', is used as a set phrase, sometimes with the singular ὧος, sometimes with the plural ὧων, and sometimes without either, attached to a singular noun or adjective or to a plural.

Four close parallels to the passages in M. Ant. and Galen are found together in R. Walzer, *Aristotelis dialogorum fragmenta* (*De philosophia*, fr. 22, coming from Bk. III), and all derive from Philo: ἀνάγκη γὰρ ὧων δι' ὧων τὸν κόσμον ἐφυλάσθαι and καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι ψυχὰι ὧων δι' ὧων ἀκίρατοί τε καὶ

θεταὶ from *De gig.* 2. 7-8 (ii, p. 43. 9 ff. Wendland), ζῶα γὰρ καὶ τούτους νοεῖα δι' ὧων φασὶν from *De plant.* 3. 12 (ii, p. 135. 17 ff. W.) and νοῦς ὧος δι' ὧων καθαρῶτατος εἶναι λέγεται from *De somniis* i. 22. 135 (iii, p. 234. 8 W.). This raises interesting speculations about the immediate source of these passages; δι' ὧων appears not to occur in the extant works of Aristotle or in any pre-Hellenistic author. Are we to think, perhaps, of Posidonius? (Cf. W. Jaeger, *Aristotle* (E.T.), p. 146 n.)

δι' ὧων is found unattached to ὧος (ὧων) in *κράσεις* δι' ὧων, Plut. 2. 1078 c, and, modifying a singular adjective, in τὴν δ' εὐδαιμονίαν . . . δι' ὧων εἶναι καλὴν, Arius Didymus *ap.* Stob. *Ed.* ii. 129. 19-20 Wachsmuth.

A variant of the phrase is ὧν ἐξ ὧων, quoted by LS⁹ from a third century A.D. papyrus: οὐδε Φιλόξενον ὧν ἐξ ὧων εὖρον, 'I have entirely failed to find P.', *P. Oxy.* 936. 20.

D. A. REES.

University College, Bangor.

EURIPIDES, *ELECTRA* 726-42

THE Chorus tell, in a spirit of scepticism, the story that, when Thyestes seduced Aerope and stole the golden lamb, Zeus in anger reversed the course of the sun, which since that day has risen in the east and set in the west. As a consequence rain-clouds have departed to the north, and Egypt has become dry.

In his edition (1939) Denniston confessed himself baffled by two points:

(a) 733-6. 'Why a reversal of the sun's course produces (as seems to be implied) a reversal in the climates of northern and southern lands is not clear.'

(b) 739-40. λέγεται . . . στρέφει θερμὴν ἀέλιον χρυσαπὸν ἔδραν ἀλλάξαντα δυστυχίᾳ βροτείῳ θανάτῳ ἔνεκεν δίκας. Here Denniston takes χρυσαπὸν with ἀέλιον, and (in view of *I.T.* 193-4) argues that θερμὴν ἔδραν must mean the 'hot quarter of the sky'; that is to say, the quarter of the sky occupied by the sun at midday. (Denniston actually

refers to this as the zenith, but this is an inaccurate use of the term, zenith being 'the point of the sky directly overhead'.) But in that case, he asks, what has the alteration of the sun's course to do with the quarter of the sky in which it is at mid-day?

Do not these two passages explain each other? What dried up the *Ἀμμωνίδες ἔδραι* and sent the rain clouds to the north? Presumably the heat of the sun when overhead on a *new* course. We are to understand, then, that on its previous course from west to east the sun passed to the north, so that the north was dried up and the south was wet. On the new course from east to west the reverse has taken place. The point reached by the sun at midday therefore has shifted from a point north of the observer in Greece to a point south of him, i.e. over Egypt.

B. H. KEMBALL-COOK.

Repton School.

THE OLDEST MANUSCRIPT OF JUVENUS

The lists of manuscripts in our editions of the *Euangeliorum Libri IIII* are headed by Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 304 (James, ii, pp.

100-2), of Spanish or French origin and dated saec. vii by Bradshaw (Huemer, p. xxiv), saec. viii^a by Lowe (*Codd. Lat. Antiquiores*, ii, no. 127).

A century or so older, however, is the 'triangular scrap' of an uncial manuscript, saec. vi-vii, in the Vatican Library (Lat. 13501), which Lowe (l.c. i, no. 61) reproduced and described as 'Fragmentum operis incerti': it contains small parts of Juvenius

ii. 441 [non auri argentiue d]OMET POSS[essio mentem,]

442 [nec uos nummorum su]BIGAT SCFLE-
RATA [cupido.]

and

ii. 462 UOS. FLAGRIS (uinclisque feris durisque tyrannis]

463 [f]RENDENS URGE[bit pro me uiolentia saeculi.]

It was cut from the top of a leaf with part of the

upper margin. The written area must have been square or nearly square—a sign of antiquity; judging from what is missing between the first and second lines, its breadth cannot have measured less than about 200 mm., and its height was hardly more than this, for the 21 verses which filled the recto should not have occupied more than 20 lines of continuous writing. Is *F* for *E* in l. 442 misread from a manuscript in rustic capitals?

The fragment is of uncertain origin, although Lowe tentatively suggests 'a centre where Greek was spoken and written'; it was preserved in the binding of a Greek 'Lectionary written ca. A.D. 982 in Calabria'.

HERBERT THOMA.

King's College, London.

REVIEWS

HOMER'S *ILIAD*

L. A. MACKAY: *The Wrath of Homer*. Pp. vii+131. Toronto: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 19s. net.

PROFESSOR MACKAY's thesis is that the *Iliad* as we know it is a work in which a supreme poet, who lived probably in the eighth century, combined two traditional themes originally unconnected. One is the expedition of Agamemnon against the Anatolian city of Troy, undertaken to recover the wife of Menelaos who had been abducted by Paris, the other 'a border ballad of moss-trooping tribesmen' (p. 105) which tells of a struggle between the Greeks of Epirus or Macedonia against their neighbours, Balkan people of the same stock as the foe encountered by Agamemnon in the Troad. Here Achilles and Patroclus were opposed to the brothers Hector and Alexandros who occupied a hill-town or fort called Ilios. Stephanus of Byzantium supplies one Ilios in Macedonia, another in Thessaly, and a third in Thrace. The apparently Greek name Alexandros is awkward, but Professor MacKay gets over it by the hypothesis that the brothers really were Greeks who ruled over a Balkan people and had contracted Balkan marriages. The cause of their quarrel with Achilles is unknown. This story may be called 'The Vengeance of Achilles'. By the fusion of these two elements coupled with his own supreme contribution

Homer produced 'The Wrath of Homer', i.e. the *Iliad* as we have it.

Beginning with the historical background of Agamemnon's expedition, M. rightly emphasizes the commercial basis on which the prosperity of Mycenae must have rested and points out the two great routes which in the Bronze Age led from Greece and Crete to central Europe, the one by way of the Adriatic, the other by the Aegean to the Danube. In relation to these routes Mycenae occupied a strategic position, commanding the three passes which led northward to the Gulf of Corinth and also the way to the Gulf of Argos and the port of Nauplia. Along these routes traders conveyed the copper of the eastern Mediterranean and brought back the tin which they needed to produce bronze. This long-established trade, which goes back probably to the third millennium and cannot have originated much later, is ignored by M., who at this point enters the realm of romance with the suggestion that the principal export of central Europe to Greece in the Late Bronze Age was iron, carried by way of the amber port at the mouth of the Po and the Adriatic. No doubt, as M. says, a metal used only for tools and kitchen equipment is unlikely to find its way into princely tombs, but what of our L.H. III settlement sites, Mycenae, Tiryns, Asine, Korakou, Zygouries, to mention the most outstanding? That

the Hittites controlled the only supplies of iron available in this period is a matter of history, since, apart from other records, the Pharaoh, probably Ramses II, who applied for some to the Hittite ruler was told that he could not have any. Archaeological evidence confirms the record; the earliest example of malleable iron known to us is the double axe-blade, a cult object found at Ugarit and of a date not later than 1350. It may be surmised that it was a gift from the Hittite ruler to a neighbouring prince, like the dagger found in the tomb of Tutankamun. The Hittite Empire fell early in the twelfth century; near its close iron begins to appear for the first time on various Palestinian sites, at first chiefly in the form of knives and personal ornaments. Gibeah, however, yielded a plough-tip of a date before 1000, and at Gerar, besides weapons and jewellery, the tenth-century level yielded many large agricultural implements. It would seem that the inhabitants of Palestine had acquired access to one of the sources of supply formerly controlled by the Hittites and before 1000 had begun to master the technique of producing useful iron. The tale in *de Mir. Ausc.* 128 that on the Amber islands were statues of tin and bronze, the work of Daedalus who took refuge there, though quoted by M., tells against him; if it is evidence of anything, it suggests a dim tradition of the days when Early or at the latest Middle Minoans went far afield to find tin for their bronze.

The unimpeachable conclusion that commerce and not freebooting was the foundation of the wealth of Mycenae is merely introductory to the development of the main thesis, to which we must now return. The foundation of the case is the pair of double names used in Homer—Troie-Ilios, Paris-Alexandros—one hardly adequate to support the formidable superstructure. A country is often designated abroad by a name other than that used by the inhabitants; what is Germany to us is Deutschland to the dwellers there and Allemagne, a name going back to the Middle Ages, to France, and we describe

as a Dutchman one who calls himself a Nederlander or Hollander. More appositely, *Graecia capta* was known to her conquerors by that name (though how she came by it is something of a mystery) or by that of Achaea. For the emergence of an alien name for Troy ample opportunity is afforded by the close commercial relations which for about two and a half millennia existed between the Anatolian city and mainland Greece, an intercourse guaranteed by the pottery series which extends from Early Helladic ware in Troy I to the latest type of 'Granary' Mycenaean in VII A. That the new name appeared in the Middle Helladic period, in which M.H. ware abounded on both sides of the Aegaeon and an invasion of the Greek-speakers with whom it is associated spread over Greece, having left their record in Troy and in the Chalcidic peninsula, is a reasonable hypothesis, however incapable of demonstration; that an eighth-century Homer could have suddenly imposed on the city of heroic legend a name which she had never borne, derived from an obscure and backward part of Greece, is one that strains belief too far. That M.'s pre-Homeric Agamemnon poem was in hexameters we are entitled to assume in view of the large number of traditional elements in the structure of the Homeric hexameter; the assumption reveals a strong motive for the introduction of the double nomenclature. Troie makes a poor and monotonous contribution to a hexameter line; Ilios, though not much more productive, approximately doubles the number of positions available for the city's name. In the case of Paris the need was even more urgent. The name occurs once as ~~, elsewhere by position as ~-; the genitive makes a unique appearance, giving ~~-~. Paris is no name for a hero in hexameters; presumably the moss-troopers' ballad was in a less exacting metre. At any rate, under that name he figures only 11 times, whereas the appearances of Alexandros number 45. To any Greek of the eighth century and indeed much earlier the name must have appeared to be an epithet meaning 'Bulwark against

Warriors';¹ the facts, however, that it nowhere appears as an ordinary adjective and that the two adjectives compounded with ἀλεξ-, ἀλεξι- are ἀπαξ λεγόμενα and occur in surroundings which there is no reason to regard as traditional suggest that this is not the true explanation. -andros is matched by Maiandros, Kassandre, both on the Anatolian side; Alakšanduš of Viluša in a Hittite record looks like a slightly different form of the same name, a variation for which a parallel is at hand in Muriandros-Murianda. In view of these considerations it is difficult to see how M.'s contention that Skamandros is the Greek, Xanthus the indigenous name of the river in the Trojan plain can be maintained, and the case is settled against him by the only other instance in which the speech of gods and men is distinguished. κύμνιδις is the human, χαλκίς the divine form of the name of the bird whose shape Hypnos assumes in order to take part in the beguiling of Zeus, and the former is of a regular Anatolian type. The etymology of χαλκός is obscure, but it can hardly be doubted that it had been the word used by the Greeks for bronze from their first acquaintance with the metal. The meaning conveyed to them by χαλκίς is immaterial; it may have been 'brown bird'. The language of the gods is that spoken by the Zeus-descended kings. The value of this descent as a title to kingship may possibly account for the fact that Aeacides is associated with Achilles in addition to the patronymic Peleides-Peleion which is proper to him; Peleus, to whom it belongs, is given it

¹ Such an epithet might well be used as the equivalent of a personal name. A parallel case may perhaps be found in Richard Cœur de Lion; the poetical record of his deeds is regrettably scanty, but in the English metrical romance of the first half of the fourteenth century which bears his name he is once addressed as Coer de Lyon; the combination of name and epithet is fairly frequent. The poet had no great metrical difficulties to contend with.

on three occasions only, by Thetis and Achilles. This suggestion derives some support from the fact that in the fight with Asteropaeus (*Φ* 152 ff.), who boasts his descent from the river Axius, Achilles, previously described as Aeacides, triumphs over his fallen foe with the rejoinder that such ancestry avails little against direct descent from Zeus: he himself is one of the Zeus-born because he is the son of Peleus Aeacides. The usage may be normal: we have no parallel case, since no other Greek leader is known to have had a superannuated father living at home.

In historic times no Aeacid dynasty is known. The only bearer of the name known to history is Aeacides son of Arybas and father of Pyrrhus, who was expelled by the Molossians and Epirots over whom he ruled in virtue of his descent from Neoptolemus *alias* Pyrrhus son of Achilles. Aeacides was his personal name, the dynastic name of the royal house being, as Plutarch informs us, Pyrrhidae.

The most solid part of the book is that devoted to the examination of place-names and ethnics relevant to the *Iliad* and their distribution over north-western Greece, in the regions which border the northern half of the Aegean and along certain parts of the Black Sea coasts. M. is inclined to deduce movements at an earlier date than that commonly assumed and sometimes in unorthodox directions, but, inasmuch as there is no means of establishing a chronological sequence, admits the inconclusive nature of the evidence. Here, however, excavation on well-selected sites (some of those offered the reader can be discarded at sight) might determine dates of occupation, which would be a result of great value.

None the less, despite its ingenuity and the research expended on it, *The Wrath of Homer* fails to make a case.

H. L. LORIMER.

Oxford.

HOMERIC STUDIES

Johannes Th. KAKRIDIS: *Homeric Researches*. (Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, vol. XLV.) Pp. viii+168. Lund: Gleerup, 1949. Paper, kr. 15.

THE author of this book claims that his analytical technique is new. It is based on the use of poetic contradiction instead of logical contradiction as a criterion for analysis, and a belief that Homeric methods of composition can be paralleled in modern Greek popular songs. By 'poetic contradiction' he means any violation of his rule 'that all the constituents of the scene shall fulfil its poetic purpose, that all its details converge to the same end, the end imposed by the part played by the scene in the poem as a whole'. If this rule is broken, 'then we may suspect that behind the Homeric composition is hidden an older creation, a prototype, the details of which Homer has not been able to assimilate to the new surrounding'. This 'neo-analytical method' reveals, he claims, 'a truly great poet, who unhesitatingly borrows from his models rich material—motifs, actions, speeches, scenes etc.—, but does not incorporate it in his work as it is, as a compiler would do, but transfers it to other characters and other myths'. Against the false criterion of logical contradiction Kakridis argues effectively with the aid of a parallel from popular Greek poetry: the resurrection of Pylaemenes in *Il.* xiii. 658, and Athena's forgotten spear in *Od.* i. 128 ff., are negligible and insignificant in a long oral poem.

Next K. applies this analytical method to the story of Meleager as told by Phoenix in the Embassy (*Il.* ix. 527 ff.). I propose to criticize later the propositions numbered in the following summary. (i) A comparison with other versions of the story as found in classical authors and in folk-tales ranging from Turkey to Iceland convinces him that the Three Fates and the Fatal Log belonged to the primitive pre-Homeric prototype, and that Althea's curse is an epic innovation together with the wrath

of Meleager. Next he examines the order of the suppliants to Meleager in Phoenix's narrative: first, priests sent by the Elders, then his father, then his mother and sisters, then his 'best and dearest companions', and, last, his wife. This, K. claims, (ii) diverges from the normal 'ascending scale of affection', in which friends always rank below parents, and is an innovation by Homer to suit the circumstances of the Embassy. Althea's joining in supplication to the son she had previously cursed is 'completely unjustifiable' in Phoenix's narrative. So he concludes that there was a pre-Homeric epic, the *Meleagris*, in which (iii) Althea's change of heart was better motivated and 'the ascending scale of affection' was undisturbed. In its last scene (iv) 'the woman for whose love Meleager returned to the battle *should* [my italics] reappear to mourn over his lifeless body . . .'. He adds criticisms of Schadewaldt's and Noë's different views on the *Meleagris*, and a commendably cautious discussion of possible matriarchal influences in early Greek folk-lore. In the end readers are presented with an obligation to believe in an 'epic which Homer must have followed'.

But while the author's initial diffidence about his theory rapidly disappears, the reviewer's steadily increased. The method of argument in books on pre-Homeric Greek literature is distressingly familiar: a possibility becomes, with the turn of a page but without a grain more of clear evidence, a probability; by the end of the section it is a certainty and can be used as a basis for analysing the very basis on which it (most insecurely) stands. Against K.'s hypotheses stand the following objections. (i) There is nothing to prove that variations in post-Homeric tradition are not simply post-Homeric accretions or alterations of Homer's version. (ii) K.'s 'ascending scale of affection' is based on three passages only (*Il.* vi. 450 ff., Eur. *Alc.* 15 f., Pausanias vii. 12. 1, where K. makes a good emendation)—hardly enough to establish a

norm. It does not hold in *Il.* xxii. 25 ff., and the high ranking of the companions in Phoenix's account may simply reflect the general Homeric sentiment which Alcinous voices in *Od.* viii. 585-6

... οὐ μὲν τι κασιγνήτοιο χερσίων
γίνεται, ὅς κεν ἑταῖρος ἐὼν πεπνυμένα εἶδῃ.

Similarly the highest ranking of the wife, which K. argues is strictly unsuitable to Phoenix's purpose (and therefore a vestige of the *Meleagris*), may simply indicate Homer's general tendency to exalt the status of wives. Against K.'s view that every detail in a given episode should be faultlessly *ad hoc*, I would hold that Homer has certain fundamental ethical convictions which may override any local exigencies. It seems to me that K., unawares, is applying ballad principles to an epic poem. When K. argues (iii, and as a cardinal principle throughout the book) that faulty motivation implies faulty adaptation of older material, many may agree. But an equally valid view is that Homer's economy often leaves his audience to supply or ignore obvious motivations and that, at times, he offers only the most perfunctory excuse, because *semper ad eventum festinat*. Further (iv) to make Meleager's motive purely all-for-love seems to me to be false to archaic sentiment; Cleopatra's reference to the danger threatening husbands, city, children, and wives is far from being inappropriate in a supposed pre-Homeric epic.

Next K. examines the scenes between

Paris Hector and Helen, and Hector the Trojans and Andromache, in the light of his *Meleagris* theories. I intend to examine his main argument (Paris's alleged wrath) in detail elsewhere. His conclusion is that both when the scene describes how the angry Paris is persuaded by Helen to go and fight, and also when the unangry Hector is *not* persuaded by Andromache *not* to fight, *Meleagris* influence is clear, because Homer is not 'a blind imitator'. Once again K. cannot see the wood for the trees. Partings between warrior husbands, reluctant or eager, and bored or loving wives, persuasive or unpersuasive, must have been commonplaces of archaic Greek life and literature, and not a monopoly of the *Meleagris*.

In subsequent chapters K. tries to establish a pre-Homeric *Achilleis* (previous articles of his on this subject being prior to Pestalozzi's book) by similar circular reasonings. This assumed, he explains the difficulties in *Il.* xviii. 18 ff., xxiii. 192 ff., and xxiv. 610 ff. Many other possible explanations are omitted, like poor Atalanta in his account of the Meleager story. Chapter V on 'Elements of Popular Style in Homer's Poetry' makes many sound and illuminating observations. Indeed the use made of Greek popular songs and folk-lore right through the book is most valuable, suggesting many promising developments. In this direction the author may justly claim both originality and a fair degree of certainty.

W. B. STANFORD.

Trinity College, Dublin.

HESIOD AND AESCHYLUS

Friedrich SOLMSEN: *Hesiod and Aeschylus*. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vol. XXX.) Pp. viii+230. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 16s. net.

THIS important work, in two parts (I, Hesiod; II, Solon, pp. 107-23, and Aeschylus), is essentially an attempt to relate Aeschylus to the Hesiodic tradition.

The *Theogony* illustrates Hesiod's his-

torical approach to theology; but Professor Solmsen is not concerned to trace all Hesiod's contact with immemorial myths (some of which indeed have their home eastward in Eden). Hesiod's originality, he points out (p. 21), lies 'in the selection and combination of those that could be composed into a satisfactory and, from his point of view, meaningful history of the divine dynasty—a history that in some respects foreshadows the tragic trilogy of guilt

and punishment and that at the same time brings out the evolution from a world of cosmic and physical forces to a world order of moral, social, and "artistic" deities'. Hesiod's presentation of the progeny of Night illustrates (p. 30) 'his peculiar, speculative interest in the "problem of evil"'. His exaltation of the wisdom and power of Zeus is notable in the story of Styx, of the infancy of Zeus, of Prometheus, and of the victory over the Titans; 'the lines which mark the end of these four sections, vv. 403, 506, 613-616, 881-885, tell a good part of the story' (p. 54). 'The marriages and the children who spring from them are an essential part of the new world order. . . . There are the Muses; there are the Horae—Dike, Eirene, and Eunomie; there are the Charites' (p. 55); and if he did not think it spurious Professor Solmsen would add the marriage with Metis. Of the synthesis of new and old in Hesiod's system he remarks (p. 75): 'Zeus does not make a complete break with the past. . . . Fundamentally, however, it is Hesiod who finds it impossible to break with the past. Hesiod is not a radical.'

Considering the *Works and Days*, so far as it develops ideas already noted in the *Theogony*, Professor Solmsen writes (p. 88): 'We should realize to what a remarkably high degree Hesiod's theological conceptions are bound up with, nay inspired by, the context of which they form part.' As I have the misfortune to hold a peculiar view of the nature and occasion of *W.D.* 1-285 I should have expressed myself differently on some of the points Professor Solmsen here takes up; but I am not putting that against his thesis: the importance of Justice in Hesiod's theology and in his influence on later thought.

In all this Professor Solmsen finds much that appealed to Aeschylus as 'a speculative poet' (p. 179): and this theme is developed, in a discussion of the *Prometheia* and *Eumenides*, with a wealth of suggestion, argument, and observation of which a short review can give no adequate summary or just impression. The author disclaims any

attempt to exhaust his subject; but it seems fair and relevant to suggest that the thesis which holds this book together, and gives Solon a central place in it, could be reinforced by a closer consideration of Aeschylus' political thought, even in the narrower sense of that adjective. From Homer to Aeschylus Greek literature is tinged with thoughts of the *πόλις* and its problems. The *Iliad* as a whole (and not only in its latter part, which Professor Solmsen adduces, pp. 174 f.) was full of suggestion for Aeschylus, interested as he was in the history of civilization (that is one reason why he gives his Prometheus so much more than the subtlety of man's first friend, the serpent, in the version of Genesis), and not least in the history of juridical progress and in the pattern of pacification, often by judicial inquest, after violence. For the increase of pride and vengeful passion which leads Achilles to spurn the *λαραί* of appeasement and amends, and from which the tragedy of the *Iliad* flows, is the very spirit that most menaced the growing *πόλις*, of which our *Iliad* is as much the product as Tennyson's *Arthuriad* is of Victorian England. And in that tale of unrepentant *ὑβρις* and righteous vengeance, the *Odyssey*, the ending of the endless chain of retribution is as plainly a living problem which the early *πόλις* must leave entirely to Athena, acting for Zeus, as it is a living achievement of the *πόλις* in the days of the *Oresteia*, which can show the problem solved by the divinely aided arm of Athena's city. Solon's place in this book proves the author's sense of the importance of politics in the tradition with which he is concerned. But recoiling, it seems, from the revolutionary politics which Professor Thomson seeks to impose upon Aeschylus, Professor Solmsen, speaking of the Erinyes (p. 185), prefers 'to find the source of Aeschylus' vivid and profound conceptions in the mythical and theological tradition which had been molded into form by earlier poets', and (pp. 183 f.) acutely points out the parallel between the 'genealogical-historical structure' of Hesiod's system of divinities and Aeschylus' conception of the

Erinyes as children of Night and representatives of an earlier stage in order and law. But in the tradition which inspired the juridical progress of the Greeks Hesiod's *Εὐνομία* shared honour inseparably with his *Δίκη* as the basis of prosperous *Ειρήνη*. It is a small point, but not altogether unremarkable, that at least at p. 34 and (where the disorder is evidently not all the printer's) at p. 55 Hesiod's list of these three, *Εὐνομίην τε Δίκην τε καὶ Ειρήνην τεθαλυίαν*, is rearranged, for the worse; and I believe Hesiod's *Εὐνομία* has more importance in the Hesiodic tradition than even Professor Solmsen indicates. Certainly 'it

might be helpful to contrast the approach of these great Athenians' (Solon and Aeschylus) 'with that of Pindar' (p. 106); but, with great respect, and by way not of disparagement but of confirmation of this work, I suggest that it would be more helpful to compare them, especially in their remarkable and striking veneration for the Horai, jointly and severally, on whose cult is founded that traditional aristocratic thought which in politics brings the Athenian Aeschylus so close to the great Theban.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

DRAMATIC IRONY

A. C. SEDGWICK: *Of Irony, Especially in Drama*. Pp. ix+127. Toronto University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

PROFESSOR SEDGWICK has reprinted the four lectures on Irony in Drama which he delivered at Toronto on the Alexander Foundation in 1934. Although the lecture form is unchanged, they make pleasant reading.

Irony is a subject on which it is easier to be interesting than to be precise. The original meaning of *εἰρωνεία* has little relation to the sense the word usually bears to-day, and when it is applied by analogy to drama to become dramatic irony the sense is so vague that one meaning shades off by gradations into many others. It would be a convenience if we could mean less by it, but all mean the same. Although S. writes well on the confused history of the word, his own use of it is unduly wide, and it is not always clear whether he refers to dramatic irony or to irony in drama, which is quite different.

S. starts from 'general dramatic irony' which is very general indeed, since the attitude of the spectator is said to be in itself ironic. Though there may be warrant for this view in the writings of others, it is hardly the impression one gets from watching the audience at a play. From this we pass to 'specific dramatic irony', which is general irony present in such concentra-

tion as to be unmistakable. In the third and fourth lectures the *Oresteia* and *Othello* are examined from this point of view.

There are two sorts of situation to which we naturally apply the words dramatic or tragic irony. One, when someone on the stage reveals a failure to comprehend a situation of which the audience have understanding, as when both Oedipus and the Chorus are full of blind confidence about the secret of the birth of Oedipus just before the dreadful truth is revealed; the other, when a character uses language with two sets of meanings, one of which expresses the reality, the other his own mistaken reading of it. It is common to both that they depend on the ignorance of those on the stage with regard to matters on which the audience are better informed.

It is clear that this sort of situation will arise most often in plays which are written round plots familiar to the audience, especially if the issue is underlined, as often in Sophocles, by oracles. Accordingly S. is hardly justified in saying that what Thirwall called Sophoclean irony might equally well have taken its name from Euripides. The difference between the two is marked by the habit peculiar to Sophocles of stressing the blindness not only of the hero but of the chorus at crucial moments. Nor, if we reserve the term dramatic irony for the cases mentioned

above, can it be relevant to Iago's speech in Act II, Sc. 3 'Touch me not so near', which is rather an example of irony in drama. But S. did well to choose *Othello* as by far the most Greek in feeling and structure of the great Elizabethan plays.

This is not a book which casts a flood of light on dark places. Since the confusion in which the subject is involved is mainly due to imprecise and undefined terms, perhaps new light was

hardly to be expected. But S., who is thoroughly at home with the drama of several languages, makes many good points in the course of his discussion and shows a discriminating appreciation of great literature.

Verrall's ascription of *Choephori* 931-4 to Pylades instead of to the Chorus should not have been printed without a warning that this is not the accepted text.

D. W. LUCAS.

King's College, Cambridge.

TRAGEDY

Hans Jürgen BADEN: *Das Tragische. Die Erkenntnisse der griechischen Tragödie*. Pp. 152. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1948. Paper, RM. 6.

THE first edition of this book, which appeared in 1941, aroused, so the author tells, the wrath both of classical scholars and of Herr Rosenberg and his *weltanschauliche, Metöken*. This is quite understandable. Herr Baden's subject is the relation of man to the Universe, and exalted by his theme he ignores Party and State as well as the existence of classical scholars. A more serious failing is that Herr Baden does not give references for his quotations, and that the verse translations from which he quotes, however well they may render the spirit of the original, add a good deal to the letter. Once at least the author himself seems to have been led seriously astray. He attributes to Sophocles an anticipation of the doctrine of the Atonement; one man, if he is wholly sinless, may sacrifice himself for the sin of mankind: 'Denn eine Seele könnte büßen für die Welt, Wenn sie sich im Drange reiner Liebe gibt.' This presumably represents *O.C.* 498-9, where Oedipus says that Ismene can perform the rites of purification on his behalf, not that she is to sacrifice herself. Such errors, however, matter less than they might, since B.'s quotations are used rather to illustrate his ideas than as the material from which they are built up. Indeed, he gives the impression that he comes to Greek Tragedy with a very clear idea of what he wants to find in it. His theme is the essential

tragedy of human life, and in Greek Tragedy more than in any other he finds it portrayed in its true nature, relentlessly stripped of all optimistic illusions. Oedipus is a Greek Adam, symbol of the damnation of mankind. Though he is often rhetorical and repetitive, his subject rouses him to a sombre eloquence from which we learn more, perhaps, about the writer than about Greek Tragedy.

The first of the three main sections into which the book falls deals with 'die Tragik der Entscheidung'. Man has perpetually to make decisions, but it is rarely open to him to make ones which are wholly good or incapable of being maligned. Usually he must choose blindly, or choose between alternatives both of which are evil. Though decisions are inevitably a part of any complicated human action, this way of looking at life is not in fact characteristic of the Greek tragic poets, however natural it may be to one who has lived through the Nazi revolution.

The second part consists of an examination of the tragic plight of men under the heads of guilt, suffering, love, death, etc., illustrated by quotations from the dramatists which, while doing justice to their wide range of experience, are often a very incomplete indication of the meaning of the plays from which they are drawn.

The third section, 'Tragik und Glaube', deals with the possible reactions of man to his terrible environment. He may believe in the gods and resign himself to his sufferings in the faith that they are

part of a divine plan which he must accept even though he cannot comprehend it; and he may believe in a judgement and a life beyond the grave. This, it is suggested, is roughly the attitude of Aeschylus. But men will not for ever believe in gods who disregard their prayers, especially if they show no greater moral superiority than the gods of Greece. There comes a stage when men accept the existence of the gods but no longer trust them, or like Ajax reject them as evil and unjust; then resignation is only awareness of impotence, and there is nothing to hope for but the peace of death, which is now regarded as an endless sleep. This is the position of Sophocles, though both he and Aeschylus sometimes seem to be feeling their way towards another solution, which is to exalt Zeus to the rank of a unique and omnipotent deity. The last stage is that of the atheist Euripides, who acknowledges no governing power but Fate or Chance. His heroes must face the inevitable doom without any glimmer of hope of divine grace, and it is for this reason that Aristotle called him the most tragic of the poets.

There is not very much in this account likely to win assent. It is a weakness that few plays are discussed as a

whole, and when Herr Baden does venture a judgement on a particular work it is often highly eccentric. In the *Persae* it is a mere whim that causes the gods to favour the Greeks rather than Xerxes. In the *Ajax* Athena is obviously evil and vindictive and the final reconciliation is out of harmony with the rest of the play because the Atreidae feebly forgo their rights. And many generalizations about the dramatists are questionable. Aeschylus' belief and Sophocles' disbelief in a future life cannot be asserted without many qualifications. Nor was Euripides simply an atheist, if he was one in any sense. Fragment 1018 *ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ἐν ἐκάστῳ θεός*, which is here taken to mean that man has no other god than himself to rely on, was understood by those who quoted it to be a reference to the divine material from which the human soul is formed.

It is a pity that Herr Baden did not pay more attention to such conclusions as scholars are agreed on; he could have saved himself from many misapprehensions without really cramping his style. But scholarship is not really relevant to this bitter and powerful work.

D. W. LUCAS.

King's College, Cambridge.

THE PROPHET OF THE ATTIC STAGE

Karl REINHARDT: *Aischylos als Regisseur und Theologe*. Pp. 168. Bern: Francke, 1949. Cloth, 9.60 Sw. fr.

THIS monograph is No. 6 of a series, 'Sammlung Überlieferung und Auftrag', edited by Wilhelm Szilasi and Ernesto Grassi. If it is a fair sample, the value of the works the series contains is greater than the modest size would indicate. In a short preface the author disclaims originality and says he wishes merely 'gewisse bereitliegende Dinge in ein helleres Licht zu rücken'; but he brings a keen mind as well as good scholarship to the interpretation of a difficult author whom each generation since his death has been bound to re-read and re-appreciate.

Very briefly stated, his main point seems to be that Aeschylus deals in

antitheses—Prometheus and Zeus, the Erinyes and the Eumenides, and many others—and that the best, if not the only way to present these effectively is by the use of stagecraft, sometimes including quite startling and spectacular effects. 'Mit dem Regiekünstler entwickelt sich zugleich in Aischylos der Theologe' (p. 12). This he holds to be a unique phenomenon, unique at all events for the Greek stage. Whether he is always successful in applying the thesis to the many problems contained in the surviving plays is not certain; but at least in trying to apply it and seeking solutions thereby of difficulties which he never minimizes, he raises a number of highly interesting points and shows fine taste and insight in his discussions of them. He mentions the

Suppliants, *Persians*, and *Septem* only incidentally, the last forming the subject of a parallel, which seems to the reviewer not very happy, between certain features of it and of the *Choephoroe* (pp. 123-5). The analysis of the *Prometheus* occupies pp. 27-76. One of the most outstanding features of it is the definite and convincing rejection of the superficially attractive theory according to which Zeus somehow develops or evolves during the action, so that in the *Prometheus Unbound* he is a righteous and merciful god whom Prometheus can respect. The material of the tragic conflict is furnished by Prometheus (promoted, perhaps, by Aeschylus himself, from a popular culture-hero with Titan connexions to a full-fledged Titan, see p. 32) and Zeus, who represent respectively Intelligence (*Geist*) and Power. There is plainly no room for either to develop during the action; how they ever were reconciled is a problem which is still unsolved after Reinhardt's discussion.

In dealing with the *Oresteia* the author gives us among other things a most admirable analysis of the *Agamemnon* (pp. 80-110), in which all the principal features both of the dramatic technique and of the contents are brought out with a completeness remarkable in so short a treatment. Merely as an example of the insight shown I mention the account on p. 107 of Klytaimnestra's attitude, her fear of 'das Dämonische' contrasted with her absence of fear of any merely human opposition. Continuing with the next play, Reinhardt very rightly takes sides against Wilamowitz and denies that Orestes needs the long process of invo-

cation of his dead father to make him resolve to carry out his duty of blood-revenge. He is indeed strengthened by it, or by the power of the ghost which is brought into play by it, but the proper comparison is 'all die vielen Lieder, Tänze, Riten bei den sogenannten Primitiven, durch welche zum Kampf Ausziehende bis zur Ekstase einander bestärken und durchdringen mit den Geistern, die in ihnen und für sie kämpfen' (p. 119). The discussion of the Nurse's half-comic role, its resemblances to and differences from the part of the Porter in *Macbeth* (pp. 131 ff.) is subtle. Good insight is shown also when, once more opposing Wilamowitz, he emphasizes (p. 139) the reality of the Erinyes in the concluding scene, which are no phantoms of Orestes' heated imagination. Dealing with the *Eumenides*, he rather states than solves the most puzzling problem of the play, namely (pp. 144-54) the curiously ungodlike and petty nature of the arguments on both sides in the trial scene. He has no ready-made solution for the other puzzle, the identification of the Erinyes with the widely different Eumenides, but he recognizes its existence (pp. 154 ff.).

To discuss the points of detail in which I differ from Reinhardt would take a disproportionate amount of space; for the most part they are very small, often merely matters of the reading or interpretation of a single verse or even a single word. The printers have done their work well; the only misprint (or miswriting) which I have noted is Lykaïos for Lykeios on p. 104.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS

Sir Frank FLETCHER: *Notes to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. Pp. 79. Oxford: Blackwell, 1949. Paper, 4s. 6d. net.

THESE are the notes of a man of good taste, fairly wide reading, and a respectable acquaintance with the principal commentaries on the *Agamemnon* and some of the other relevant literature, but

not of one with a specialist's knowledge of the poet's language or of the writings concerning him. They do not pretend to form a complete commentary; if enlarged to make one, they would suffice to give an undergraduate a very fair working knowledge of the play, enough for examination purposes at least. Their quality may best be shown by giving a

few examples of passages in which they are right as against various commentators, others where they are definitely wrong, and one or two where they are doubtful or partly right.

Sir Frank begins well by seeing that ἀγκαθεν in line 3 does not mean 'head on arms'. His own view is that it, or ἀνέκαθεν, means 'on the roof', which may be right. In 51 he adopts Headlam's practically certain emendation ὑπατηλεχέων. In 69-71 he follows Farnell's reading and interpretation, the only ones which make sense, thus doing better, for instance, than Groeneboom. In 385 he happily renders πειθῶ by 'temptation'. At 692 he gets γίγαντος nearly right; 'it suggests boisterousness, and perhaps rebellion against law'. Actually, it is perhaps the nearest word in classical Greek to 'devilish'. At 1228-30 he has almost got free of the prevalent superstition that the passage is corrupt. There are several other places where commentators differ and he sides with those who are certainly or probably right.

Some mistakes which he might have corrected are these. At 7 he seems not to know either Housman's simple transposition, which makes sense of the passage, or the papyrus evidence that the line is genuine. At 14 he neglects

the evidence that a weak and unimportant word may stand where ἐμὴν does. At 28 he does not mention Eitrem's full explanation of what ὀλολυγμός means. At 60 he absurdly supposes that κρείσσων means 'mightier than the Atridae'. At 115 he repeats the well-worn error about the white-tailed eagle signifying the cowardice of Menelaos; the bird is a particularly bold one and Menelaos is not a coward in Aeschylus. At 327 he quite misunderstands the situation, not seeing that civilians are among the slain, and so proposes a needless emendation, while at 336 he hesitates to accept Stanley's brilliant correction, δ' εὐδαίμονες for δυσδαίμονες, which he also misconstrues. In 429 he does not mention Blass's highly probable alteration ἀπένθεια. At 535 Liddell-Scott-Jones would have put him right as to the meaning of ῥυσίου, and there are several other instances of misunderstanding the sense of a word. I omit places where I merely happen to disagree with the view he takes.

So modest-sized a writing cannot pretend to be a great contribution to Aeschylean criticism, but it is a contribution and worth having, despite faults.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE PRE-SOCRATICS

Werner JAEGER: *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*. Pp. vi+259. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.

PROFESSOR JAEGER'S Gifford Lectures were delivered at St. Andrews in 1936, but publication was delayed for ten years, and they now appear 'in a greatly improved form' and with an extensive apparatus of notes. It goes without saying that this is a work of considerable learning, but, though it claims to place the speculations of the pre-Socratics in a new light by treading a middle path between what one may call the 'scientific' and the 'religious' schools of interpretation, it does not really add very much to what has for some time been established as the ortho-

dox view, at any rate in England. The only English work on the pre-Socratics with which the author seems to be acquainted is Burnet's, and it is almost incredible that a book should be published in English on this subject in 1947, whose index contains not a single reference to the work of Cornford, to name only the most glaring omission. An English reader is bound to be irritated both by the enunciation, with considerable parade, of conclusions which he has long regarded as commonplaces and by the assumption of the truth of a number of statements which have been shown to be at any rate open to serious question.

Theology is defined as 'the natural (rational) approach to the problem of

God', and Jaeger's object is to trace the course of philosophical thought on this subject in the period which preceded its first systematic exposition by Plato. Each of the greater pre-Socratics is successively treated from this point of view, with the surprising exception of Pythagoras, whose thought is not distinguished from that of the mystery religions. Although there are chapters entitled 'The So-called Orphic Theogonies' and 'Origin of the Doctrine of the Soul's Divinity', it seems clear that Jaeger's interest is mainly in the more 'scientific' thinkers—he minimizes the ancient distinction between Ionian and Italian types of philosophy—and, though he rejects what he calls Burnet's 'scientism', he constantly refers to the Milesians as 'men of pure science', and seems to make no allowance for the possible influence of unphilosophical religious imagery upon their systems. His treatment of Anaximander in particular is unlikely to command universal assent. He may be right in holding that Anaximander gave the name ἀρχή to his ἀπειρον (cf. Zeller-Mondolfo, vol. ii, p. 163 n.), but it is very difficult to accept his contention that the characteristically Aristotelian argument of *Physics* iii. 203^{b6} (ἀπαντα γὰρ ἢ ἀρχὴ ἢ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτλ.) reproduces the course of an argument employed by Anaximander himself, and that the words καὶ τοῦτ' εἶναι τὸ θεῖον are not a deduction by Aristotle depending in syntax on the previous δοκεῖ, but a version in *oratio obliqua* of Anaximander's actual words. Moreover, Jaeger sees in the innumerable coexistent worlds ascribed to Anaximander by some interpreters a basis for 'a kind of philosophical theogony', and entirely ignores the damaging criticism by Cornford (*C.Q.* xxviii. 1) of the evidence for such a belief in any thinker earlier than the atomists.

Whether Anaximander did or did not identify his ἀπειρον with the Divine is obviously a matter of importance for Jaeger's argument, but few even of those who reject his contention, or who regard it as at any rate unproved, will quarrel with the general thesis of the succeeding chapters that, though they

may not have called it God, the ultimate reality of most pre-Socratics, whether it be the ἀπειρον of Anaximander or the One Being of Parmenides, the λόγος of Heraclitus or the νοῦς of Anaxagoras, is invested by them with attributes appropriate to divinity. On many disputed points of detailed interpretation Jaeger is on the right side. He refuses to see in the God of Xenophanes an earlier version of the One Being of Parmenides, and he emphasizes that the attitude of Parmenides to his One Being (like that of Heraclitus to his λόγος) is fundamentally a religious attitude. He is clearly right in rejecting the ἐκπύρωσις as part of Heraclitus' system, and in treating him as a thinker of quite a different type from the Milesians. But such conclusions are not novel, and, though one must not look in a book with this title for a complete exposition of pre-Socratic thought, there are surprising omissions. An interesting parallel is drawn between Hesiod and Parmenides' proem (p. 92), but the problem of connexion between the two parts of Parmenides' work and consequently between the real and the apparent world, is treated very superficially, and, of course, without reference to Cornford's discussion in *Plato and Parmenides*. Again, when we are told (p. 113) that 'Heraclitus is the first thinker who not only wishes to know the truth but also holds that this knowledge will renew men's lives', we are driven to wonder again at the omission of Pythagoras, in whom metaphysics and ethics are more obviously interdependent than in any other pre-Socratic. Finally, though Jaeger properly rejects any dichotomy of the personality of Empedocles of the kind suggested by Burnet, he never explicitly states the point in which the difficulty of reconciling the doctrine of the *Purifications* with the poem *On Nature* consists, that whereas, in the former, the soul is an immortal being from another world, in the latter it appears, at least, to be identified with the blood and to be therefore perishable.

There is an interesting final chapter on the ideas put forward in the fifth century on the nature and origin of

religious beliefs, but it will be seen from what has been said that, as a whole, this cannot be regarded as a very important book, and the conclusions are never sufficiently striking to warrant the unfortunately ponderous and pontifical tone in which they are put forward. Occasionally this becomes almost naïve, as when we read (p. 225, n. 23): 'After I had advocated this restoration of the text' (*ἀσση* for *ἄσση* in Parmenides fr. 1, l. 3) 'I noticed that Meineke had anticipated it, which seems to prove its correctness.' On p. 230, n. 36 Jaeger seems to claim that he was the first person to point out the long-recognized

truth that the *Republic* is 'not a treatise on civil government, . . . but on the education of the human soul'.

The book is not easy reading. Its style is turgid and woolly, and there is much unnecessary jargon. The translator of the German original probably had a difficult task, and not all the blame should rest with him, but he cannot escape responsibility for such locutions as 'heroization', 'fixate', 'patterned', and 'capitalised on', to name but a few particularly repellent examples of his diction.

W. HAMILTON.

Westminster School.

ANAXAGORAS

Felix M. CLEVE: *The Philosophy of Anaxagoras*. An attempt at reconstruction. Pp. xxiv+167. New York: King's Crown Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 16s. net.

THE system of Anaxagoras, like every other pre-Socratic system, poses a number of problems which, though they may ultimately prove insoluble, must be at least provisionally answered before the system as a whole can be plausibly reconstructed. What is the precise meaning of the famous dictum that 'there is a portion of everything in everything'? What are the 'things' of which everything contains a portion, and is the relationship of the 'portions' so contained one of mere juxtaposition or of fusion? Again, what is the nature and mode of operation of *Nous*? Is it really material, as Anaxagoras' own terminology seems to suggest, or was Anaxagoras rather feeling after, but unable adequately to describe, an incorporeal principle? To these and other such questions an answer is still awaited that shall command universal assent.

It is the more encouraging, therefore, to find a book that obviously sets out to provide such an answer; and a sentence in the Foreword, that 'for some thirty years I have been attempting to reconstruct the genuine system . . . of Anaxagoras', is calculated to raise the reader's hopes high. Unfortunately,

however, it very soon becomes evident that such hopes are not to be too easily fulfilled: a rapid glance through the book suffices to show that it is marred by a number of damaging, if superficial, eccentricities and defects. The eye is affronted, on the very first page of chapter i, by the word '*homoiomereses*'; and when, on p. 23, we encounter "*μὴ γινώσθαι*" (*mignysthai*) or "*μίσγεσθαι*" (*misgesthai*), and "*μεμειγμένον εἶναι*" (*memeigménon einai*), the question inevitably arises for whose benefit these uncouth transliterations are included. Such isolated English words, moreover, as 'succumbency' (p. 7) or 'aseity' (pp. 27 and 155) begin early to impair our faith in the author's English style; while such a sentence as '*At the very instant, however, when such balloon mereia or such mereias balloon is shut on all sides, at the very instant when the kernel has been entirely wrapped up in the shell impenetrable to it—at this very instant Nous has ceased to be a one, an undivided being*' (p. 101) and many translations typified by that of *ὡς τάχιστα εἰδέειν τὸ βέλτιστον καὶ τὸ χεῖρον* as 'in order to gain knowledge of the best and the lesser the speediest possible' (p. 156) can leave no doubt that the author would have been better advised to employ his native tongue. When, finally, to quote the most striking of such superficial peculiarities last, we find that (with no further explanation

than that provided in the Prologue, that

Anaxagoras of Klazomenai,
Master of Euripides and Pericles of Athens,
was a beholder and an artist),

the fragments of Anaxagoras are throughout printed as though they were in verse, a graver doubt is likely to supervene as to the validity of the author's judgement.

And on a closer reading, unhappily, this doubt proves fully justified. One of the most interesting aspects of Anaxagoras is surely the obvious illustration he affords of the influence of his Eleatic predecessors. It is startling to find that in his 159 pages Dr. Cleve mentions Parmenides once only—and that in a footnote—and Zeno never. When he does tell us anything about earlier thinkers, it is usually a very dubious opinion dogmatically stated without attempt at justification. The assertion that 'it was an established fact, since Thales, that *moonlight was nothing but reflected sunlight*' (p. 66); the description of the system of Heraclitus as 'bright and glary and almost palpable' (p. 121); or the contention that the period of Anaxagoras 'was neither the time of an unsophisticated nor of a sophisticated materialism, but of no materialism whatsoever' (p. 148);—such opinions call, surely, for something more than bald dogmatic assertion.

Even his treatment of Anaxagoras himself is hardly more convincing. It is, to begin with, not devoid of inconsistencies. On p. 51, for instance, we read that 'the most conspicuous manifestation of centrifugal force is that as a result of it everywhere *the bodies fall in the direction rectangular to the hori-*

zontal plane, instead of falling towards the geometrical centre of the earth'. And yet, as soon afterwards as p. 56, we learn that 'in Anaxagoras' opinion, *the heavy does not gravitate "downwards", but toward the centre of the axis of rotation*'. In the second place, certain central sections of Dr. Cleve's reconstruction (especially, perhaps, the earlier part of the chapter entitled 'The Souls') seem to be largely figments of his own imagination. Even when he cites ancient authorities, he does so very uncritically. Aetios, for example, having been roundly trounced for his 'egregious nonsense' (p. 61 note), is thereafter, whenever it suits the author, accepted without question as a reliable witness. Finally—and this is perhaps the most damaging criticism of all—when, as occasionally, a point is made that seems at once ingenious and plausible, it too often proves to lack the originality that Dr. Cleve appears to claim for it. He is not, for instance, by any means the first to maintain that the elements of Anaxagoras were the opposites; and it seems strange, when he propounds fusion as the solution to the problem raised above, that there should be no reference at all to the Appendix on this subject in Dr. Cyril Bailey's *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus*.

It may be that there is more of value in Dr. Cleve's book than I have been able to detect; but it will at any rate be clear, from the few examples that I have cited, that there is much in it to which objection may legitimately be taken.

Note: italics are in every case the author's, not my own.

J. E. RAVEN.

King's College, Cambridge.

PYTHAGOREANS AND ELEATICS

J. E. RAVEN: *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*. An account of the interaction between the two opposed schools during the fifth and early fourth centuries B.C. Pp. viii + 196. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THIS is an important book which goes far towards elucidating a standing problem in the history of Greek thought.

Perhaps not many will be disposed to face the full rigour—and some self-imposed austerities—of its argument. The data are notoriously meagre and often fluid, the discussion is detailed, and sometimes subtle; nevertheless, I shall attempt the hazardous task of summarizing the main features.

Cornford's views on Pythagoreanism,

as published in *C.Q.* xvi, xvii, were somewhat modified in *Plato and Parmenides*. But he continued to base himself on the statement of Alexander Polyhistor that 'the first principle of all things is the One'. The early Pythagoreans, he held, were Monists; their One or Monad, not to be confused with the first unit of number, gave rise to the pairs of opposites which give their philosophy of nature its dualistic character. R. makes a sound case for the older view, which accords with the evidence of Aristotle: the earliest Pythagoreanism asserted an eternal dualism of Limit and Unlimited, Good and Bad, Odd and Even; it was primarily an ethico-religious system and therefore, like Zoroastrianism which R. finds curiously parallel, it gave some sort of preference to Limit, regarding Good as somehow more real and enduring than Evil. Alexander's statement really means that the One was held to be the starting-point of cosmogony; and this is true of both the earlier and the later Pythagoreans. The earlier generation thought that the One was Odd and Limit; it was 'the embodiment of Limit in the Unlimited', and it generated all things by 'inhaling' more and more of the surrounding Unlimited. For the later, or post-Parmenidean, generations, the One was no longer Odd or Limit but the first compound of the two ultimate opposing principles, the 'Even-Odd'. But at no time did this school regard the One as the *source* of the Opposites; it is either one of them or a resultant of both.

Cornford recognized no such continuity of doctrine. He held that under the pressure of Parmenides' arguments against dualism there arose a doctrine of Number-Atomism, which posited an unlimited plurality of ones or units, each of them as 'ultimate' as the Eleatic One. Hence he censured Aristotle for confusing the earlier and the later systems. R., however, finds no evidence for two such radically opposed systems within the Pythagorean school, which never regarded the units or monads as eternal, and never showed any tendency to dethrone the two primeval Opposites in favour of a plurality

of irreducible number-atoms. There is no reason to suppose that the Pythagorean 'units', attacked by Zeno, were ever alleged to possess all the reality which belonged to Parmenides' One Being. The Pythagoreans answered Parmenides by producing, not a new theory (of Number-Atomism), but (as Plato implies) a series of destructive arguments, of which the effect may be seen (R. suggests) in Melissus; for it was probably in an attempt to counter these Pythagorean attacks that Melissus altered the basis of Eleaticism by making the One unlimited.

According to Cornford the Pythagoreans were at first content to say that things *imitate* numbers, and it was the later Number-Atomists who held that things *are* numbers. But these two views, as Cornford later admitted, could be easily held at the same time; and it is inherently unlikely that the later, and presumably more sophisticated, thinkers took literally what their predecessors understood figuratively. R. gives a more probable account of the developments arising from the Eleatic attack upon the Void. The earlier view that bodies consist of discrete units or points, each point being indivisible and having magnitude, was abandoned. It was now maintained that corporeal matter is continuous and infinitely divisible. By this means the Pythagoreans were able to adhere to their original equation (or confusion) of geometrical figures and physical bodies. They were thus driven by Zeno in the opposite direction to that taken by Democritus who, under the same compulsion apparently, drew a distinction between geometrical magnitude and corporeal matter. One cannot here follow R. into all the details of his inevitably somewhat speculative reconstruction; but one must note the ingenious rehabilitation of Eurytus, who has usually been regarded as a mere figure of fun. In his trick with the pebbles which he arranged in the outline of natural objects (e.g. a horse), Eurytus was probably applying a principle, to be ascribed to Philolaus, that the essence of a thing is determined by the number of the points required to

bound the surfaces which are characteristically its own. The doctrine that 'things are numbers' thus comes to mean that whether a thing be a geometrical figure or a physical body, it is the (minimum) number of points needed to fix its essential shape; and this applies also to entities like Justice, which the Pythagoreans, like the Stoics afterwards, conceived as spatial. The number in each case is the element of Limit; the Unlimited is the infinitely divisible continuum of physical matter. Natural objects are the product of the imposition of the former upon the latter. Clearly Plato was familiar with this analysis; and the book concludes with a brief examination of Plato's debt to the Pythagoreans, with especial reference to *Phileb.* 23 c ff., where the theory is modified by making each pair of opposites combine in a single *ἀνείρον*, and by introducing 'the cause of the mixture'. As to the Ideas, even Aristotle 'is compelled to admit that they were indeed Plato's and not the Pythagoreans' invention'; they represent the new and better

'science of measurement' (*Polit.* 284 e), of which the Pythagoreans, lacking dialectic, had no conception.

I must forgo the temptation to discuss many subsidiary matters: R.'s anachronistic use of the word 'scientific', his over-estimate of Atomism, his view of the Way of Seeming as an 'explanation' (another hard word) of sensible phenomena, his inconsistencies on the question whether the Pythagoreans were Parmenides' sole target, his view that the soul-harmony doctrine is (in spite of *Phaedo*) specifically Pythagorean. But on the main issues my only regret is that R. has caused some obscurity by unnecessarily tackling some insoluble problems; e.g. the chapter on the One and Numbers raises so many puzzles, implicit and explicit, that one cannot be accused of obscurantism for welcoming the moral that 'inconsistencies are in the very nature of the Pythagorean attitude', and that, even in their cosmology, only 'a certain coherence' can be claimed.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

'PLAY' IN PLATO

G. J. DE VRIES: *Spel bij Plato*. Pp. 391. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1949. Cloth, fl. 9.50.

DE VRIES begins by reviewing some of the theories of aesthetic experience which have made use of the concept of 'play'. By a coincidence Plato called his writings 'play' without prejudice to their serious purpose. De V. points out that not only artistic creation but 'philosophizing', and even the 'task' of living, may all deserve to be classified as 'play', if 'play' means a free and spontaneous activity flowing from a rich inner store of 'felicity' and 'conviction'. Whether he is consistent in then excluding from 'play' those passages where Plato writes in an earnestly ethical or pedagogical mood, or from the depths of a 'political' ardour aroused by contemporary conditions (so that the *Gorgias*, for example, contains very little 'play'), is a question which cannot be discussed here. De V.'s state-

ment that if Plato were a 'mystic' he would be incapable of 'play', depends on a view of mysticism which does injustice to many mystics; but this too would require too lengthy discussion. In fact the bulk of the book is concerned with the various ways in which Plato apparently enjoys himself in his writings, so that 'play' often implies a tone of 'playfulness' (which is a different thing) as well as a mood of artistry. De V. looks for the play-element in the dialogue-form with its dramatic 'painting' of scene and character, criticizing P. Friedländer's rather fanciful attempts to find a deeper meaning everywhere: the breaking of the dawn, for example, in *Prot.* 312 A is part of the 'play' and has no symbolic implication. He describes Plato's use of metaphors and of paralogsms, his parodies of poets and sophists, his irony and humour, his satirical treatment of popular idols, and his mockery of himself and of his own

methods. His 'labour of love' has produced, he believes, an introduction to the study of Plato. It is also an introduction and a guide to many of Plato's modern commentators, and to the literature on some scores of Platonic problems on which de V. here pronounces briefly, and sometimes dogmatically, in rather too optimistic reliance upon the maxim *medio tutissimus*. A few of the questions raised seem rather empty, for example, whether the picture of the Cave is 'play'; and the half-dozen pages on *Parm.* shed little light and seem too hard for an 'introduction'. But in general this is a highly

commendable work. Dutch students will, I believe, find its translations, paraphrases, summaries, and comments very readable and interesting. Because of its wide range and novel point of view the book should also appeal, in spite of a certain, largely unavoidable, superficiality, to specialist students of Plato. As an outcome of a store of Platonic learning comfortably carried, the book itself is an example of the kind of 'play' in which professional scholars are too rarely qualified to indulge.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

MATHEMATICS IN PLATO AND ARISTOTLE

- (1) Charles MUGLER: *Platon et la recherche mathématique de son temps*. Pp. xxviii + 426. Strasbourg: Heitz, 1948. Paper, 2,000 fr.
- (2) Sir Thomas HEATH: *Mathematics in Aristotle*. Pp. xiv + 291. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 21s. net.

PERHAPS the leading idea of M. Mugler's book is that Plato exercised an important influence by his criticism of mathematical procedure in the light of an established philosophical system. Greek geometry required to be purged of its empiricism, and Plato's criticism was salutary and constructive. He took an important part in the debate which arose from the discovery of irrational quantities. In this, and in many other instances, mathematical problems have left their impress upon Plato's philosophy; but on the whole he was a critic of mathematical methods and did not, as might be thought, take them as they were and employ them upon philosophical problems. The aim of the book is to show this by a study of various special topics—similarity and equality, the infinite in space and time, the infinitely small, etc.; moreover, various stages in Plato's reflection on mathematical method are distinguished, in a way which I have not been able to follow; and M. Mugler, in contrast to other recent writers, defends the statement of Proclus that Plato is to be

credited with the invention of the method of analysis.

It should be said at once that the book suffers from alarming defects of style and presentation. The author does not seem to have faced the question what audience he has in view. He introduces the physics of the *Timaeus*, and the proof of reminiscence in the *Meno*, in terms suitable for a beginner, but it is hard to see what such a person would make of the greater part of the book. Then there is a mass of totally irrelevant matter, which is never brought to bear upon the philosophical issue under discussion. Every problem is remorselessly traced right back to Thales and Pythagoras, every use of a mathematical term is made the occasion for a long disquisition on its history. The sentences are long and shapeless (to take one at random: 'La théorie du temps au moyen de laquelle Platon remplace la perpétuité immanente que le retour éternel des anciens philosophes semblait garantir à l'existence terrestre par l'éternité transcendante des formes est le couronnement métaphysique des idées du philosophe sur le temps considéré à l'échelle cosmique'), and M. Mugler has apparently the same horror of pronouns as the Greek mathematicians had of the irrational. Euclid is 'le grand Alexandrin', Tannéry 'le savant géomètre et historien des sciences', Plato innumerable times 'le grand

Athénien' or 'le grand penseur'. It is a pity that some well-wisher did not warn the author against this irritating mannerism.

Next, the author's acquaintance with foreign literature is imperfect. In dealing with Zeno's paradoxes he does not draw upon the discussions of Ross and H. D. P. Lee, as he might have done with advantage. I find no reference to Cornford's articles on Mathematics and Dialectic in the *Republic*, or to Robinson's *Plato's Earlier Dialectic*, or to the various studies in English dealing with the interpretation of the similes of the Line and Cave, an omission which has led to blunders about the status of *διάνοια*.

Lastly, the author, like many researchers, is carried away by his subject; and from the proposition that Plato was an intelligent critic of the procedure of mathematics, he proceeds by degrees to the view that this criticism was the decisive factor in the evolution of his thought.

That M. Mugler has given a useful commentary on several particular passages in the dialogues and has sometimes brought to light a mathematical implication which is not obvious on the surface, I should readily admit. That he has exposed the true motives of Plato's thought, showing how he was influenced in philosophy by mathematical procedure, and how he came to influence it in return, I find it much harder to believe. The author is too much inclined to jump from mathematics to philosophy on the strength of some vague analogy or distant terminological echo; and also to help out the exposition by reference to modern scientific views, such as the quantum theory, without saying in so many words that these were anticipated by Plato. And in some instances I cannot but feel that the author misses the main point of a Platonic argument. Where is it said in the *Meno* that reminiscence explains man's capacity for mathematical and other *a priori* knowledge? Where is any distinction drawn between one kind of learning and another? Elsewhere M. Mugler seems to count on

excessive credulity on the part of the reader. He wants to show that Plato resolutely rejected the idea of recurring cycles of world-history and consistently viewed time as a non-reversible process. Hence he declares that the myth in the *Politicus* has no astronomical significance, but is a beautiful symbol of the deductive and synthetic movements of human reasoning.

There is no Index Locorum, and the book abounds in misprints, including a rather startling *Arioste* for *Aristote* (p. 418).

Mathematics in Aristotle is a commentary upon all the mathematical passages in the Aristotelian corpus, including the *Problems*, the *Mechanica*, etc., which are given here in Sir Thomas Heath's own translation. He had just completed the work at the time of his death in 1940. Lady Heath, and those who have assisted her in preparing the edition, deserve congratulation on the accuracy of their work.¹

Heath's commentary on the passages, some of which he had already discussed on other occasions, is always thorough and illuminating, and he is most scrupulous in taking account of previous expositions. The inquiry is of interest, as he explains, not because Aristotle's comments on mathematical problems are particularly profound, but because most of his illustrations of scientific method are taken from mathematics, and the historian of mathematics can glean from him some hints as to the contents of the text-books in use immediately before the time of Euclid.

There is an admirable note on Aristotle's account of the first principles of mathematical reasoning, which explains the various types of assumption that have to be made (*existence* of the genus, such as magnitude or number, and of certain other primary things such as the unit and the point; *definitions* of certain other things whose existence can be proved). The difference between Aristotle's terminology and that of Euclid is also clearly explained. Heath, differing

¹ I have only noticed a single misprint: Δ on p. 214 and p. xii of the summary of contents should be Z .

from H. D. P. Lee, holds that Aristotle uses *ὑπόθεσις* and the corresponding verb to cover a wide range of assumptions and only in one passage, for a special purpose, proposes to restrict it to an assumption of existence or non-existence.

Behind all this there seem to be some obscure questions which Heath, perhaps wisely, has left alone. Can the mathematician, as such, offer *no* argument in defence of his assumptions? If so, what validity have his definitions of the straight line, the odd, the even, etc.? Aristotle certainly holds that the basic premisses are known to us through intuition, and that there is no central principle, such as the Form of the Good, from which they can be deduced, though they can, if necessary, be defended against criticism by the use of dialectical

reasoning. Further, if physics provides any analogy to mathematics, it may be said that A. does in his treatise on that subject offer an analysis of such essential notions as movement and cause—that this analysis, in fact, occupies a great part of the treatise; but then A. might, if pressed for an answer, say that this analysis of the *ἀρχαί* belongs rather to First Philosophy than to Physics. In the same way a mathematician merely offers verbal definitions of number, the unit, etc., which, together with postulates of existence, are the 'hypotheses' of his science. He may choose to add a more philosophical account of number, unity, or space, but he is not obliged to do so, nor is it, strictly speaking, a part of his science.

D. J. ALLAN.

University of Edinburgh.

ARISTOTLE'S ANALYTICS

W. D. Ross: *Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics*. A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary. Pp. x + 690. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 42s. net.

It was in 1924 that Sir David Ross brought out his *Metaphysics*, and in 1936 that his *Physics* followed it; beside these he has now raised a third and quite equally impressive monument of Aristotelian scholarship, characterized by the same learning, thoroughness, and acumen. The introduction (95 pp.) discusses the title and plan of the two works, the chronological relation of *An. Pr.* to *An. Post.*, the course of the argument, and the main characteristics of A.'s logic, and the material for establishing the text. Text and apparatus are followed by a large folding table of the syllogistic moods, a commentary of 400 pages including under each chapter a summary which is in some cases almost a paraphrase, and indexes, English and Greek, to the introduction and commentary.

It was in 1844-6 that Waitz's *Organon* appeared, and hitherto it has, for the most part, had no successor. There was thus ample room for R.'s edition in view of the mass of more recent work,

the most important being the Berlin Greek commentaries (Waitz knew only Alexander, in the Juntine edition of 1521, and the extracts in the *Scholía* of Brandis), Maier's *Die Syllogistik des Aristoteles*, and the translations of *An. Pr.* by Jenkinson and *An. Post.* by Mure (the latter with copious annotations, among other things reviving the use of Zabarella). R. has drawn upon all these, as also upon Bonitz's *Aristotelische Studien*, Becker's work on the modal syllogism, and numerous lesser publications. Among older scholars he has had most frequent recourse to Zabarella and Pacius, the former of whom Waitz seems not to have known.

For his text R. relies mainly on the oldest five manuscripts (*ABC δ n*). He has himself collated *C* and *n* throughout, and perhaps the main feature of his text is the importance he assigns to the latter. With these witnesses and the evidence of the Greek commentators, there is little to be expected from the Latin versions¹, and R. ignores them; he quotes, however, the readings of two Syriac versions of *An. Pr.*, II of the fifth century and *I* of the seventh to

¹ On these see C. H. Haskins in *Harv. St. Cl. Phil.* xxv, 1914, pp. 87-105.

eighth, and notes how frequently the latter agrees with *n* (cf., e.g., 57^b24). The general consensus of manuscripts and commentators, viewed in conjunction with the number of cases where emendation needs to be employed or interpolations excised, points—though R. says, perhaps, all too little directly of the probable history of the *Analytics* from the time of Theophrastus to that of our evidence—to a single tradition of not later than the early centuries A.D. which had already suffered from the attentions (and inattentions) of scribes and expositors. Conjecture is thus called for, and the changes which R. adopts from previous scholars and proposes himself are numerous, though usually slight. In *An. Post.* he accepts several from Bonitz. Of the many excisions which Becker suggests in *An. Pr.*, R. adopts some (31^b21-9, 32^a21-9, 34^b2-6), but several he is probably, some he is clearly, right in opposing (cf. 25^a29-34, 32^b4-22, 25-32, 34^b8-11, 14-17, 19-35^a2, 38^a22-3). He himself brackets 45^a9-16, 55^b7-9, 59^a32-41, and 81^a33-4, together with several short phrases; among these latter excisions one may commend particularly [ἡ διαιρουμένον] 24^b17, [τὸ] . . . [αὐτῶν] 48^b7, [τὸ μὴ σιληθῆναι] 78^b2, [ἔχει] 89^a18, [τί ἐστι] 93^b31. At 32^b14 he need not have hesitated to omit καὶ with Γ and Pacius (cf. 35^b2). But many of R.'s most cogent suggestions lie, as did those of his master Bywater, in the less obtrusive field of repunctuation, as at 28^b19-20, 30^b2-5, 37^a14, 88^b36, 91^a24-5, 91^b20, 95^a6-8, 98^a35-4, and in particular at 27^a10, where he is saved from the necessity of altering the text with Waitz, and 32^b25-32, whose genuineness he thus maintains against Becker. Among his other conjectures the following are particularly to be commended: πρότερον for καθόλου 40^a2-3, ἐστι 44^a17, ἀντιστρέφει 67^b30, ^b39, γνωρίσαντα 71^a17, οὐ 71^a19, ἐκείνῳ 72^a29, λέγεται 76^b36, ταῦτά 84^b21, ζῶον καὶ πεζὸν (καὶ δίπουν) 92^a30, οἰκία γέγονεν 95^b39, καθόλου for ἀναγκαῖα 96^b2, τοῖς for ταῖς 96^b12. On the other hand, it is not perhaps necessary to insert δ at 77^b21, though R. may well be right in so doing; τὸν μανθάνοντ' ἀλέγοντες at 50^a2 is implausible, and πρὸς

τὸν μανθάνοντα λέγοντες (Pacius) is more likely to be correct; and ἡ τί ἐστι at 92^b17, though an improvement, still leaves the sentence obscure: should we not insert ἄλλο, or read εἰ μὴ? The suggestion that ἐνθύμημα . . . σημείων (70^a9-11) should come at the head of the chapter is most attractive, and R. is probably right in placing 77^a5-9 after 83^a35: of previous solutions Zabarella's is the most plausible, moving them to 75^b30.

Friedrich Solmsen, in his *Die Entwicklung der aristotelischen Logik und Rhetorik* (1929), argued that A., beginning his career as a logician with the semi-Platonic *Topics*, passed on to the epistemological inquiries of *An. Post. A*, and finally, becoming disillusioned with the prospects of success in this field, took refuge in the more solid certainties of formal logic (*An. Pr.*) (followed by *An. Post. B*, where the general background is scientific rather than mathematical). He convinced J. L. Stocks (*C.Q.* xxvii, 1933, pp. 115-24), but an article by R. (*Philosophical Review*, xlviii, 1939, pp. 251-72) examined Solmsen's arguments and showed conclusively that the evidence all indicated *An. Pr.* to be earlier than *An. Post.*, and the introduction to his edition repeats the arguments. R. dates *An. Post. c.* 347-4, and allows, with Solmsen, that there was a gap between Books *A* and *B*. The *Topics* R. holds, with Maier, Solmsen, and the consensus of scholars, to be early, and *De Interp.* also (with Case, against Maier). Here, too, he seems to be sound. About the authenticity of the *Categories* he seems, as in his article 'Aristotle' in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, to be dubious: in the *Journal of Philosophy*, xxxvi, 1939, pp. 431-3, he had pronounced definitely for the whole work as Aristotelian. An interesting point for the chronology of Aristotle is raised, though R. does not discuss this, by the close of *An. Post. A* (89^b7-9), which seems to presuppose the prior existence of *An. Γ* 4-7 and of something covering the ground of *E.N. Z*; but the passage may well be a later addition. R. emphasizes the looseness of structure and lack of unity that the composition frequently manifests: he

speaks (p. 421) of *An. Pr. A* 32-45 as a series of loosely connected notes, writes similarly of *An. Pr. B* 21, and thinks *An. Pr. A* 25 perhaps later than *An. Post. A* 32.

A comparison of the commentary with Waitz shows advances everywhere, due in part to the editor's own thoroughness and in part to the Greek commentators. R.'s comments are much bulkier, and yet by the side of W.'s they have an air of spareness and rigid economy; everything is strictly to the point, and digressions into byways of linguistic usage or modern philosophy are rigidly eschewed, while the mass of early Greek commentaries now at hand has removed the point of W.'s numerous quotations from Apuleius (or pseudo-Apuleius) and Georgius Pachymeres in *An. Pr. A*. This means that W. contains interesting and sometimes useful matter not found in R.; but for W.'s original public Bonitz's *Index* was not available, and this is a more than adequate substitute. Everywhere greater thoroughness and precision in analysing the argument are to be discerned. R. also uses the conventional logical symbols and the traditional names for the syllogistic moods, whereas W. befogs his reader with a different notation.

The treatment of a great many passages calls for mention, but we must confine ourselves to listing the following: 24^b16 (an improvement on Waitz's note), 26^b37, 27^b37 (right against Waitz in reading *μηδετέρω*), 30^a9-14, 30^b2-5, 30^b26, 34^a12-15, 34^a25-^b2 (defending A. against Becker and Tredennick), 35^b2 (right with Pacius, against Waitz, in omitting *καί*), 41^a22-^b3 (following Maier), 41^a37-40 (against Waitz), 41^b15-22 (referring to an essay of Heiberg), 45^b15-19, 50^a19-28 (against Maier), 57^b17 (against Maier), 59^a32-41, 65^a26-35, 69^b36-7 (against Cook Wilson on the doctrine of enthymeme), 70^b7-38, 71^b19-23, 74^a6-13, 75^a12-17 (stressing *ἀνάγκη* in ^a14), 75^a42, 76^a16-18 (right against Zabarella, whose words are quoted, seemingly with approval, by Mure),

77^b34-9, 78^a6-13 (right against Pacius and Waitz); and the discussions of *κοινὰ ἔννοια* (Introd., pp. 56-7), *ὅρος* (p. 290), *ἐκθεσις* (pp. 311, 412-14), error (pp. 472-5), *ἐπαγωγή* (pp. 481-5), *παράδειγμα* (p. 488), *ἀπαγωγή* (pp. 489-90), *ἐνστασις* (pp. 492-7), *καθ' αὐτό* (pp. 518-20), *ὑπάρχειν*, *ἐνυπάρχειν* (pp. 520-1), *ἀξίωμα* (pp. 531-2), *ὑπόθεσις* (p. 540), *ἀνάλυσις* (p. 549), causation (pp. 629-32, 638-47, 649-52), *λόγος ὀνοματώδης*—‘a noun-like expression’ (p. 635).

Though this is not a philosophical journal, it deserves to be added that R.'s approach is not simply that of an Aristotelian scholar; he believes firmly that despite twentieth-century attacks the formal logic of Aristotle continues and will continue to withstand criticism as of undiminished importance for its subject, just as he holds the same of Euclidean geometry. But is not A.'s logic too closely bound to his metaphysics for this to be possible? The issues cannot be embarked upon here, but few logicians today would agree with R., as he himself realizes.

The Introduction (pp. 26-7) might have mentioned the syllogistic argument of the *Eudemus* (fr. 45 R., 7 W.) for the immortality of the soul; it is a pity that at 78^b34-79^a16 R. does not refer to *Pl. Rep.* 522c-530c, on whose treatment of mathematics and (especially) astronomy this passage throws light; at *An. Post. A* 30 reference should now be made to A. Mansion, *Introduction à la physique aristotélicienne*, ed. 2 (1946), pp. 292-314, for A.'s treatment of chance in *Ph. B.* The preface slips over the date of Waitz, and Mr. H. D. P. Lee's article in *C.Q.* on ‘Geometrical Method and Aristotle's Account of First Principles’ appeared in 1935 (p. ix); on p. 286 read ‘A. Becker’; on p. 434, l. 23, for ‘(a)’ read ‘(d)’; at p. 496, l. 7, read ‘1883-4’; at p. 509, l. 17, remove the comma after *ἐπιστήμη*.

The production is a credit to publisher and printer alike.

D. A. REES.

University College, Bangor.

FROM PLATO TO HERMES TRISMEGISTOS

A. J. FESTUGIÈRE: *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*. II. Le Dieu cosmique. Pp. xvii+610. Paris: Gabalda, 1949. Paper.

THIS book is the second volume of a work which is to occupy four volumes in all; the first has already been noticed in *C.R.* (lx, 1946, 91 ff.). The title of the present instalment is in a way misleading. Father Festugière does indeed expound that part of the Hermetic doctrines which deals with immanent deity in the ordered universe; but he might have done so at much less length than six hundred-odd pages. He has preferred, since the Hermetic writings contain nothing that is really original in their teachings, to follow the doctrine from its beginnings in the *Timaeus* (or even earlier, for there are traces of it in the Socratic discourses recorded by Xenophon) through Aristotelian and post-Aristotelian philosophy, much space being given not only to the surviving Greek authors but to Cicero, as preserving a valuable record of much Hellenistic writing now lost. The whole exposition is admirably clear, suggesting that the author when he mounts his pulpit delivers excellent sermons, calculated to make the doctrines he recommends intelligible to any reasonably attentive member of his congregation. It is also adequately full, for the necessary summaries and analyses of the ancients quoted are supplemented by long extracts from them well rendered into French, with the originals of some of the most important sentences added in footnotes or parentheses in the text. It is thus a convenient work of reference, since it can be understood by itself, while for anyone who has already made some study of the subject it continually invites a re-reading of old acquaintances.

The first seventy-four pages are filled with an introduction, which reviews the Hermetic writings and draws attention especially to those treatises which speak of an immanent God. There follows (pp. 75-152) a discussion of the fourth-century origins of such a doctrine,

especially Plato, *Tim.* and *Laws*. Attention is pertinently drawn (p. 104 and elsewhere) to the double account of creation in *Tim.*, the Demiurgos being simply a mythical doublet of the world-soul necessitated by the very form of the work. This was to cause some confusion later.

The next chapter, 'L'Esprit du temps', is the first of Part II of the whole work, 'De Platon aux Stoiciens'. It occupies pp. 153-95 and deals with the spread (largely the work of the Stoics, but the idea was by no means of their creation) of the concept of the universe itself as animated by a superior intelligence and therefore worthy of adoration, not merely of admiring study. The world of Platonic Forms becomes insignificant, not only because of the criticism it was subjected to, whereof Aristotle is the main representative, but because a religion was urgently needed, but undiluted Platonism was too hard and needed too long preparation for all but a chosen few (p. 157), while the religion of the Kosmos, so to call it, was relatively simple and easily grasped. The next two chapters analyse two important works, the *Epinomis* (which F. is somewhat inclined to think, with A. E. Taylor, to have been written by Plato himself) and the *περὶ φιλοσοφίας* of Aristotle, lost to us although capable of being largely reconstructed (Appendix I, pp. 587-91, deals with one of its fragments), but widely read and remarkably influential in the centuries which followed its composition. Part III (pp. 260-340) treats of the earlier Stoics, taking the story down to Aratus and giving considerable space to Cleanthes' hymn to Zeus. Part IV (pp. 341-518) is the bulkiest and not the least interesting section of the work. It traces the history of the cosmic religion through that long period when philosophy, at least for most students of it, was eclectic, having a large stock of common ideas, *une certaine Koinè philosophique* (p. 349), which made their way, not so much through this or that authoritative work of a particular author, but rather

through handbooks and doxographies and the general tradition of the schools. F. is doubtful of the wisdom of trying to attribute too much influence to any one teacher, such as Poseidonius or Antiochus (p. 349). In such a study Cicero must bulk large, and a careful analysis of his philosophical essays occupies over a hundred pages. Although not denying him some portion of originality, at all events in the handling of the material and above all in the political works (*De r.p.* and *De legg.*), F. concludes that 'nous n'étudions pas Cicéron pour lui-même, nous ne cherchons en lui qu'un témoin. À ce titre, il est singulièrement utile, et l'on peut presque se réjouir qu'il ne se soit pas montré plus original' (p. 458).

The long fourteenth chapter (pp. 460-518) is devoted to the pseudo-Aristotelian *De Mundo*, most of which F. translates. He refuses to pin it down to any very exact date; it must be later than 40 B.C. or so (publication of Andronicus' edition of Aristotle) and cannot be later than the late second century A.D., for Tatian and Athenagoras use it, even if we suppose that Apuleius did not translate it (pp. 477-8). It is an example (Cleomedes' astronomical treatise is another) of that kind of *εἰσαγωγή* which does not confine itself to outlining elementary facts but decks itself with flowers of rhetoric and passes quickly to edifying generalities, the better to recommend itself to *les gens du monde* (p. 500).

The main work concludes with a study in some detail of Philon of Alexandria, who is introduced, not as an original thinker, which he was not, nor as having directly influenced the Hermetists, who show no sign of having read him, but as an outstanding example of the persistence of the school-tradition concerning the universe. Finally, there are three appendixes, one of which has already been mentioned; the other two discuss respectively Teles and the history of the word *θεολογία*.

Inevitably, the book contains a num-

ber of contentious statements, but they are always expressed modestly and with good temper. To deal with them would need, not a review, but a series of essays, not all short and including some which the present reviewer would not feel competent to write. A few trifles may be mentioned here, however. On p. 93 I much doubt the soundness of F.'s emendation *ἀδιάφορον* for *διαφορά* in Alcinous, *Didasc.*, p. 165. 8 in vol. vi of Hermann's Teubner edition of Plato. Incidentally, by a slip of the pen the author is called Albinus. On p. 175 F. is a little too hard on modern man in saying that his main interest in science is in its practical results. The vulgar, of course, have always thought of it in that way, and they do not change. P. 187, Isocrates when he wrote the *Panegyricus* did not yet think of Philip as the leader of Greece in a crusade against the barbarian. P. 189, Plutarch, *Moral.* 329, *Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ ἔργον παρέσχευεν*, does not, I think, mean 'c'est Alexandre qui a fourni matière à ce discours par l'œuvre qu'il accomplit', but rather 'A. furnished a practical example of that theory', 'did in fact what Zenon urged in words'. On p. 221 it is somewhat hazardous to conclude, from Aristotle's telling the story about Midas and Silenus in the lost *Eudemus*, that he held pessimistic views when he wrote it. He might, for instance, have said, 'if what Silenus said is true, Eudemus is no loser by having died'. On p. 287 Lucretius iv. 1133-4 is misquoted. To the discussion of *gloria* on p. 427 add now, what was not available when F. wrote, the dissertation of A. D. Leeman, *Gloria*, Rotterdam, 1949. On p. 489 it is anything but certain that Isocrates wrote the treatise *ad Demonicum*.

It is much to be hoped that the concluding volume of the series will contain a full index, the lack of which makes this part of the work far less convenient for consultation than it should be.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE LOEB PRUDENTIUS

H. J. THOMSON: *Prudentius*. With an English translation. In 2 vols. Vol. I. Pp. xvii+401. London: Heinemann, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

LATINISTS will welcome the appearance of the Loeb Prudentius not only on account of an excellent translation by Professor Thomson, but because the poet himself is now available in a more easily accessible form than the edition of J. Bergman in the Vienna Corpus. The Loeb Library thus completes the number of the *Poetae Latini Maiores*, a title which Prudentius may claim with regard to both Classical and Christian poets, for he has much of the quality of the Silver Age writers and in some respects surpasses them. He is best known perhaps for his remarkable mastery of metre: while preferring iambic, he innovated with anapaestic and dactylic dimeters, some of his most charming verse being in the former. His hexameters are vigorous and free from mannerisms (except for a tendency to alliteration), and he uses spondaic and four-syllable endings with effect; there is considerable licence in prosody (e.g. *cui* is a short monosyllable, while *cuique* can be a dactyl, *C. iii. 167, H. 105*), usually in short syllables that bear the metrical ictus or in words of Greek origin. Phrases taken from earlier poets are numerous, occupying 14 pages of Bergman's Index—a queer instance is *crescante cibo* (*Juv. xiii. 213, A. 716*); compare, too, the Lucretian diction of *A. 264*. He can be concise and epigrammatic, as in *H. 25-6* 'ius varium non est plenum, quia non habet alter / quidquid dispar habet: cumulum discretio carpit', and also write passages of sustained vigour, as in *H. 203 ff.*, upon the theme, a congenial one, perhaps, of the results of sin and corruption upon the world; yet he avoids most of the extravagance of the Silver Age poets, and is conspicuous for sincerity and earnestness; hyperbole does occur, a somewhat unpleasant example being *A. 719-20*, in his reference to the miracle of the Five Thousand, but at his best he justifies Mackail's judgement that his poems

'make Claudian grow pale like a candle-flame at dawn'.

If the lyrics are more readable, they rarely show real inspiration, and seem too long for the metres in which they are written. The spirit of the Ambrosian Hymn, which Prudentius does now and then succeed in catching, combines ill with the rather commonplace moral admonition of many of the *Cathermerion*. There is, however, a feeling of classic symmetry and restraint in the Preface to *contra Symmachum I*. In the longer poems, except for the moral allegory of the *Psychomachia*, interesting for its influence on Christian art, the theme is religious and doctrinal polemic, as in the *Apotheosis* and *Hamartigenia*; it may be true that, as Prof. Thomson remarks, 'the particular heresies that Prudentius chooses to attack had for the most part, at any rate in those precise forms, become by his time matters of the past'; in any case there is no lack of vigour in the trouncing, and one is even tempted to find a parallel between Prudentius flogging out-of-date heretics and Juvenal satirizing the profligates of earlier reigns. If Prudentius 'appears as a defender of the faith', it may be because heresies die hard and needed combating even in the year 400, but Thomson thinks him more a poet than a controversialist, and 'more at home in setting forth the positive faith of the Catholic Church with all the aids of his poetry and rhetoric'. Certainly there is no lack of skill in the handling; perhaps his most difficult situation is in attacking the Marcionite 'duitas' (*Hamart. 20 ff.*) and at the same time maintaining the unity of Father and Son in the Holy Trinity. It is to be noted that the phrase *Christus Deus*, very common in early Christianity, gave place later on to *Christus Dominus*; the former occurs frequently in these poems, the latter hardly at all.

Professor Thomson has adopted in the main the text of Bergman, who provided for the first time an adequate review of the manuscript tradition and an *apparatus criticus* based on the

collation of twelve manuscripts. Here and there he has quite rightly refused to follow Bergman in his deference to the authority, or rather the age, of the sixteenth-century Paris manuscript (e.g. *C.* 12. 130 *immaculatorum*, against *P.*'s practice in the use of anapaests in iambic verse, *A.* 218 *corpore*, *Ps.* *praef.* 31 *oues*); on the other hand, it seems that *asperet* might have been kept in *Ps.* 431. Thomson notes occasional divergences between classes of manuscripts, interpolations, and differences of punctuation. There is a short introduction, describing the background to the poems, which are provided with explanatory footnotes, biblical and other references. Explanatory notes are most needed in the course of the poet's attack on Roman paganism in *c. Symm.* I, and the supply is adequate. There might perhaps have been an explanation of *regale chrisma* in 586 of that poem.

The volume includes the *Cathemerinon*, *Apotheosis*, *Hamartigenia*, *Psychomachia*, and *contra Symmachum I.* To have deferred the last to vol. ii would have given that volume a better balance between hexameters and lyrics, but would have made it appreciably longer. The translation is accurate and scholarly throughout; meanings are fully brought out where implicit in the Latin, as in *Cath.* 7. 7 *quo fibra cordis expiatur vividi*, 'whereby the heart is enlivened through the cleansing of its tissues', or

Ham. 264 *rimata*, 'to reward its rum-maging', or *c. Symm.* I. 202 *inter vagitus*, 'while still at the crying stage', or in the vivid description of the arena, *c. Symm.* I 384 *quid pulvis caveae semper funebris*, 'the deathly dust that ever enshrouds the spectators'. The description of Pride in *Ps.* 186 ff. gives some idea of its quality, 'a cambric mantle hanging from her shoulders was gathered high on her breast and made a rounded knot on her bosom, and from her neck there flowed a filmy streamer that billowed as it caught the opposing breeze'. In *A.* 696 *lento umore* is well rendered 'clinging moisture'; as for *A.* 411 *ven-tose liquor*, acquaintance with Prudentian phraseology justifies the rendering 'vain spirit'; in *A.* 922. 3 it was probably hopeless to attempt to render the play on *vetus . . . verno*. In *Ps.* 522, Avarice says 'quod volvunt saecula nostrum est, quod miscet mundus, vesana negotia, nostrum', rendered 'the thoughts of all generations are of what belongs to us, all the world's busy stirring and mad trafficking is of us'; the first phrase seems rather to explain than to translate, while 'is of us' seems inadequate in both ways. To descend to smaller matters, there is a wrong quotation mark on p. 249, line 10, while there are a few misprints (pp. 98, 243, 314, 364).

J. H. MOZLEY.

Queen Mary College, London.

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY EDITOR OF THE ANNALS OF TACITUS

José RUYSSCHAERT: *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite*. Une méthode de critique textuelle au XVI^e siècle. (Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 3^e série, fasc. 34.) Pp. xviii+220. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1949. Paper.

LUSTUS LIPSIUS corrected in several hundred places the text of Tacitus as it used to be printed in the sixteenth century. He emended the text on the basis of some Renaissance editions or *apographa*. Often he divined the cor-

rect readings of the *Medicei*, from which his sources ultimately derived. In such cases his name no longer appears in the critical notes of our editions, since conjectures are now recorded only when *M* is considered faulty or doubtful. It is therefore impossible to judge Lipsius's critical acumen from the places where his name appears in our notes. The *Variorum* editions only give selected passages, and even a single edition of Lipsius's own text and commentary does not contain the whole story, since he went on

changing his mind from one edition to the next. But it is the whole story which is still of interest to the modern critic since, more often than not, Lipsius's conjectures were in the nature of stylistic and, in a lesser degree, of historical comments on the passages of Tacitus.

The subject of this book is therefore an interesting one to the reader who is concerned with the critical problems of the *Annals*. The more difficult sides of the subject are, however, ignored by the author. He fails to discuss the problems Lipsius himself grappled with; in fact he eschews discussion of any Tacitean passage. He allows a modern editor to decide for him whether a conjecture is right or wrong and, instead of criticizing the critic, divides Lipsius's conjectures into 'groups', and not very relevant groups at that.

His way of dealing with Lipsius's editorial practice is equally unfortunate. Modern terms like *recensio*, *collatio*, *eliminatio codicum* are applied to the work of an editor to whom they would have meant nothing. Lipsius was so inconsistent in these matters that he would have been amazed to hear that he had a settled *méthode de critique textuelle*.

The book is in fact of value, not for its critical analysis, but for the evidence which the author assembles. The most useful part is a list of the conjectures made, or adopted, by Lipsius in his various editions of the *Annals*. There are no less than 1,064 items, and even so the list is not really complete. The present reviewer has tested Books I and XIII, and has found omissions in both books, as at i. 13 *M'*. *Lepidum*, i. 17 *acciperent*, i. 22 *introiit*, i. 34 *ac suis*, i. 36 *concederentur*; xiii. 19 *incertum*, *Iunia Silana*, *etiam imperio*, and xiii. 49 *continetur*. The readings of *M* are not always given correctly. In several places the symbol *M* goes with the wrong reading; for instance, at i. 13 it is appended to Lipsius's emendation *eiusque* where it should go with the corrupt *etusque*, and again with the corrupt *nox vox* at i. 70. The readings of *M* are not indicated at i. 30 *considerant* and

i. 49 *intellecto*. At i. 13 *M* has *tē* (not *te*), and at i. 57 *reb*; (not *rebus*). In both cases the 'syllabic symbols' have some bearing on the corrupt readings as well as on the emendations; at i. 57 the Oxford text is more correct than is either the Teubner, Goelzer, or Lenchantin. At xiii. 36 the reading of *M*, *audirent*, is wrongly given as *auderent*, which is Lipsius's conjecture. There are not a few small flaws of this sort, which are apt to mislead the unwary.

In each item the first entry contains the reading of the printed text which Lipsius himself used. This is followed by the reading of *M* (and, in the second part, also of the *deteriores* used by Lipsius), by the various conjectures printed by Lipsius, and a brief summary of the reasons for the conjecture if they can be found in Lipsius or inferred from other contemporary editions. Symbols and abbreviations are used freely, and the reader requires some training before he can hope to make sense even of the simpler entries.

Ruysschaert has been able to identify Lipsius's own working copies of Tacitus. He concludes that the copy used for the text of Lipsius's first edition was different from that used for the commentary. The latter was prepared on the basis of the *Gryphiana* of 1542, while the text itself seems based, not as hitherto assumed, on the same book but on Rhenanus's revised edition of 1544. Hence the following emendations, now under Lipsius's name, should be restored to Rhenanus: i. 8 *inprospere repetitae*, 35 *universi*, 56 *metuebantur*, 79 *concederetur*; ii. 36 *honorem*, 56 *Servaeus*, 60 *Lycium*; iv. 8 *confirmaret*, 66 *conexus* (correct in the Oxford text as against the Teubner and Lenchantin); vi. 10 *Fufii*, and xii. 43 *prorutae*.

In other passages modern conjectures were forestalled by Lipsius; for instance, at xiii. 44, *ultum esse* had occurred to Lipsius before Wölfflin. The suggestion is a good one, as can be seen from the parallels quoted in Gerber and Greef's *Lexicon Taciteum*, p. 349, where the conjecture is wrongly attributed also. Equally, i. 31, *tracturis*, had occurred to Lipsius before Freinsheim.

The authorship of conjectures was often contested, and humanists were fond of the charge of plagiarism. Lipsius himself had been the target of several attacks. Ruyschaert has ransacked the archives, with the zeal of a counsel for the defence. He has inspected Lipsius's and Muretus's personal copies of Tacitus, has studied their *marginalia*, and has noticed some incriminating alterations, made at a later date, not failing, in true detective fashion, to base part of his case on the use of different kinds of ink. He has given some details of Claude Chifflet's unpublished edition of Tacitus—a work not without some merits at the time when it was written, but of little importance now. Attention must also be drawn to some ten new letters published by Ruyschaert in the *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome*, xiii, 1947–8. For they add much detail to the story of a *cause célèbre*—the controversy between Lipsius and Muretus. The new documents are of considerable interest even if they do not always corroborate the arguments for the defence.

Ruyschaert also offers evidence of the use made by Lipsius of the *Medicei*. Wilamowitz commended Lipsius for using readings from the *Medicei* for the first time, though he had not seen the manuscripts himself when he was in Italy. Sandys, on the other hand, thought that Lipsius did not utilize the

Medicei at all. It so happens that both were wrong, though Sandys was nearer the truth. Lipsius used the editions of 1542 and 1544 as working copies, to which he added readings from an (unidentified) *editio Veneta* of 1494 and from Modius's collation of the *editio princeps* of c. 1470. In Italy he collated two of the *deteriores*, the identity of which Dr. Ruyschaert has now established (*Vaticanus* 1863, *Neapolitanus* ivC21), and added some readings from a third (*Vaticanus* 1864), and a few taken from Rhenanus's collation of the *Budensis*. This was the basis for his edition of 1574 and of all but the last of the following editions. In 1600 and 1604 Curtius Pichena published readings from the *Medicei*. Lipsius did not relish the idea of undoing his own work. He took notice of the new readings, but looked for confirmation of his own conjectures rather than for new problems. He did, however, prepare a new edition which was finished in 1605, and appeared, posthumously, in 1607. The use which he made of the new readings was sketchy, and his last edition is in this respect inferior to Pichena's own edition which appeared in the same year. This can now be followed up in detail, since Lipsius's readings of 1607 are set out in this book along with those of his older editions.

C. O. BRINK.

University of St. Andrews.

HISTORIA AUGUSTA

Ernst HOHL: *Maximini Duo Iuli Capitolini* aus dem Corpus der sog. Historia Augusta herausgegeben und erläutert. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen.) Pp. 40. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1949. Paper, R.M. 3.50.

WE have every reason to welcome the revival of the series of *Kleine Texte* which was initiated by Lietzmann and is now continued by Kurt Aland. This number (172) of the series is edited by Professor Hohl of the University of Rostock who contributes a short preface (pp. 3–8), reproduces his own text of the *Vita* (pp. 9–28), and then on pp. 29–40 adds a brief commentary. No one

could be better qualified to act as editor of this *Vita* than Professor Hohl. In 1919 his admirable articles on the Emperor Maximin and his son Maximus appeared in vol. x of Pauly's *Realencyclopädie*, while a student of his, Hedwig Seidenschneider, in 1925 wrote an unpublished doctoral dissertation on the historical value of the *Vita*. The special interest of this biography lies in the fact that here we can follow more satisfactorily than elsewhere the way in which the author(s) of the *Historia Augusta* treated his material. His source is the history of Herodian, and apart from a passage cited from Dexippus and a pos-

sible use of 'Enmanns Kaisergeschichte' everything, in Mommsen's words, is either 'herodianisch' or 'apokryph' and historically valueless. 'Capitolinus' invents sources for his fictions: Aelius Cordus is at once 'his authority and his whipping-boy' (Mommsen), and Cordus finds his parallel in Aelius Sabinus or in the Claudius Eusthenius of the *Vita Carini*.

There is still no agreement upon the date of composition of the *Historia Augusta*: it is now generally admitted that that date must lie between the publication of the *Caesars* of Aurelius Victor and the writing by Symmachus (consul A.D. 485) of his History in which the Life of Maximinus was copied. Dessau in a famous paper dated the *Hist. Aug.* to the reign of Theodosius the Great and Alföldi would accept that dating. Professor Hohl's colleague in Rostock, Professor Hartke, has argued that the collection of imperial biographies was hastily compiled towards the close of the year 394 after the defeat of Eugenius in order to win the favour of Theodosius: it was to further 'the political, religious, economic and social

programme' of the circle of pagan nobles in Rome. But this explanation is surely incredible; could even the author(s) of the *Hist. Aug.* be so inept as to think that Theodosius would be placated by an attack upon the principle of the hereditary monarchy? The puerile account given in the *Vita* of the enormous capacity of Maximinus for food and drink is explained by Professor Hartke as a development of such aretalogies as, for example, that of Heracles in the letter of Herodes Atticus quoted in Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 2. 1. 7. This view will apparently be elaborated in Professor Hartke's forthcoming book on *Römische Kinderkaiser*. For the present some students may prefer to regard the introduction of the preposterous performances of one who was born of 'mixed-barbarian' parents (Herodian 6. 8. 1) as natural in a *Volksbuch* designed for a popular appeal; here 'nothing succeeds like excess'. For any final judgement, however, we must await the publication of Professor Hartke's second book. Meanwhile we can congratulate Professor Hohl on this pleasant little edition.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

TERTULLIAN'S *DE ANIMA*

J. H. WASZINK: *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima*. Edited with introduction and commentary. Pp. 650+lix. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff, 1947. Cloth, fl. 40.

TERTULLIAN'S short treatise has been edited by Dr. Waszink with extraordinary thoroughness and erudition. He has provided a text, an English paraphrase of each chapter, and a literal rendering of some of the more difficult passages, the whole constituting a work of formidable bulk (including over 500 closely printed pages of commentary) and no less formidable learning. Even a book of these dimensions has not exhausted all that its author wishes to tell us, and the reader is referred to a later article for a detailed treatment of Tertullian's use of *clausulae*.

The part of the work which is likely to prove most valuable to the majority

of readers of Tertullian is the revised text and the admirably full critical apparatus. Much is done to correct the unsatisfactory text provided by the 'Vienna Corpus' edition. So far as the subject-matter of the treatise is concerned, the book begins well with a useful survey of the circumstances of its composition and a good general appreciation of its character and purpose, in which Tertullian's polemical interests are fully recognized. A very large proportion of the introduction and the detailed commentary is occupied with a remarkably thorough and erudite discussion of Tertullian's sources, and in particular of his use of Soranus. To the classical student much of the value of the book is likely to lie in its survey of the doxographical material contained in the *De Anima*, especially the probable sources of the work of Soranus (through whom most of Tertullian's knowledge of

the philosophers was derived), and the material which Tertullian obtained from Arius Didymus and Albinus. In handling this question of Tertullian's debt to Soranus and other pagan authors Dr. Waszink wisely remembers, against the view of H. Karpp (*Z.N.T.W.* xxxiii, 1934), that Tertullian does not swallow his authorities whole: he was 'a highly obstinate and original character, who, when borrowing views or facts from others, usually adapted them most carefully to his special purposes' (p. 34).

In contrast to the very full treatment accorded to his use of Soranus and other classical writers, relatively little weight is sometimes attached to Tertullian's scriptural and patristic sources; thus the influence of St. Paul (2 Cor. v. 1) in Tertullian's *domus animae caro est* seems to be recognized only as an afterthought, and for a full discussion of the Christian sources of chapter 50 the reader is referred elsewhere (pp. 439, 519).

The difficult problems of Tertullian's Latin are fully and carefully dealt with, as, for instance, in the notes on his use of the ablative (pp. 274-5). In places the subject-matter, as opposed to textual and linguistic points, seems to deserve fuller treatment. Thus, Tertullian's famous hydraulic organ might be more explicitly described, and the interesting passage on the *clavis paradisi* more thoroughly elucidated (pp. 217, 563).

This is, as has been suggested above, a book for the classicist rather than the student of patristics. For the latter it is distinctly disappointing; indeed the theologian is tempted to wonder whether Tertullian is really worth so much

labour if, when all is done, a commentary on this scale can provide no satisfactory information about the significance of *paracletus*, *persona*, *haeresis*, *satisfactio*, *sacramentum*, and *substantia* (though there is admittedly a good discussion of *nomen*).

A few points of detail appear to be questionable. *Sacramentum* (II. 4) denotes the divine secret relating to the Church and Christ, rather than the actual passage of Scripture (p. 198); *administratur* (14. 4) does not mean 'is used' (p. 217), but 'is distributed' (in the exercise of its function, without suffering actual division); it is surely hardly necessary to attribute the remark, 'Opimitas sapientiam impedit' (20. 4) to a Montanist propensity towards excessive fasting, or to see Tertullian's Montanism exemplified in 21. 6; and it is surprising to read that *φωτισθῆντας* in Heb. 6. 4 'requires a different' (i.e., apparently, non-baptismal) 'interpretation'. Tertullian's theory of the *homo interior* might now be compared with that of Origen in the recently discovered 'Dialogue with Heraclides' (16, 17).

The English of this book is faulty in places. The worst example is the sentence, 'Wenn [*sic*] still being a catholic, Tert. fervently opposed to the coming into prominence of women in the Church' (p. 167), and there are several instances of such expressions as 'avoid to note'. One or two misprints have been noted, such as *sribunda* (p. 444), and a serious misprint in Hebrew on p. 483.

G. W. H. LAMPE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

AN INTRODUCTION TO ANCIENT HISTORY

H. BENGTON: *Einführung in die alte Geschichte*. Pp. viii+185. Munich: Biederstein, 1949. Cloth, DM. 10.50.

AN introductory manual may be intended for readers new to the subject, who require a general look-round, or for more advanced students who need to acquire the technique of research. The present volume does not fit exactly into either of these classes. It contains sections on such adjuncts of research as

epigraphy, papyrology, and numismatics, and it explains, *inter alia*, the intricacies of the Egyptian calendar; and the large amount of space which it devotes to bibliographies, both general and sectional, suggests that Bengtson is addressing himself to an esoteric circle. But the greater part of his book is taken up with short reviews of the main sources of ancient history (historiography and general literature), and

with a general survey of the main problems of chronology, geography, and anthropology. It is therefore by these that his work should be mainly judged.

Bengtson's book is characterized throughout by sound judgement and a nice sense of values. His best chapter is the one on anthropology, on which he writes with refreshing sanity and a healthy spirit of scepticism. He also deals discerningly with the geographical milieu, and with the historical value of legends—a subject on which he usually accepts the safe guidance of Nilsson.

It is but natural that in a short treatise on a subject ranging from the Ancient Near East to the age of Justinian some topics of more than passing importance must be crowded out. In the chapter on chronology we miss a reference to the solar eclipses which are the key-points for reckoning ancient dates, and to the problem of the *annus urbis conditae*. The Letters of Cicero find mention in the bibliography only; save in the case of Thucydides, no ruling is given on the authenticity of speeches inserted into historical texts; and a mere gamma or delta mark does not give sufficient guidance for the appreciation of authors like Diodorus and Appian, who drew now and then on excellent sources.

In the section on epigraphy Bengtson

does not mention Boeckh's exemplary work on the Athenian naval inventories, or that of Glotz on the Delian price-lists. He passes over the *Lex Iulia Municipalis* (now generally accepted as an authentic act of Caesar), and the tariff of Diocletian; and he does not refer to the Roman calendars as sources for the history of Roman religion. To compensate for these addenda, space might have been saved by not cataloguing in full the fifteen volumes of the Greek and the sixteen volumes of the Latin corpus.

In the list of papyri the only desideratum is Claudius' rescript on Jews and Greeks at Alexandria. The section on coins is complete in essentials and sets forth clearly their multifarious historical value. In the section on monuments mention might have been made of the value of air-surveys for the location of ancient sites.

The above list of omissions may perhaps be discounted as a counsel of perfection. In any case, it is a merit of Bengtson's work that he has made room for an adequate discussion of the more important topics, and has boldly jettisoned much that might have been said but could at a pinch be omitted. And the general impression remains: *multum (atque disertum) in parvo*.

M. CARY.

MIGHT AND RIGHT IN EARLY GREECE

Hartvig FRISCH: *Might and Right in Antiquity. I: From Homer to the Persian Wars*. Translated by C. C. Martin-dale. (Humanitas, II.) Pp. 276; 8 plates. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1949. Paper, Kr. 30.

'OUR subject is . . . the Mind of Antiquity as to the basis of Right' (p. 32), from Homer to Simonides: and through many vexed questions in Greek history and literature the author's clear-sighted tenacity holds him steadily to his course.

After Nilsson and Schadewaldt he finds unity of composition in each of Homer's epics and dates them 'far down towards the historical period' (p. 37). Against Glotz's theory of clan-society

in Homer he cites the lot of the orphan, *Il.* xxii. 488; he might have added ix. 354 and xii. 433, and Thersites—as J. B. Bury says, 'assuredly a product of the town'. Dr. Frisch places Homer in an epoch of kingship distinct from Hesiod's age of aristocracy. But Homer's kings are partly fictitious. He naturally imports into the life of the traditional kings (and people), as *pari ratione* into Olympus, the practices and ideals of the 'parliament square' of the evidently well-established Greek *πόλις* of his own world, a world of varied, loosely constitutional, blends of kingship and aristocracy, politically and juridically indistinguishable from the world of

Hesiod. I do not think it 'peculiar to the peasant Hesiod that with all this' (pessimism) 'he is explicitly a man of peace and hates violence' (pp. 86 f.). So is Homer, as we can see from what he made of warlike traditions in his *Iliad*. Certainly (ibid.) in *W.D.* war 'is always joined with the epithets like "evil" or "wretched"'. But more significant of Homer's like attitude than even the epithets listed under πόλεμος in L.-S. is his (probably original) application of *κυδιάνειρα*, elsewhere stereotyped with μάχη, to ἀγορή in *Il.* i. 490. And we hear too much of 'the peasant Hesiod'. For what was Hesiod? Like Homer, an αἰοιδός, and second only to him in that profession.

Distinguishing, soundly enough, θέμις, 'Law and Right', from δίκη, 'Right and proper' (p. 45), Dr. Frisch deduces (p. 49), partly from the personification of Θέμις but not of δίκη in Homer, that 'Themis suggests the older and more venerable idea, while Dike, in Homeric times, implied a relatively new, accurate, juridic idea, which, so far, had created around itself no halo of divinity or of higher righteousness'. Something must be said on this admittedly dark subject. The varied meanings of δίκη, the way, seem to have grown from a notion of customary right as a fact of social life, in such connexions as claiming, arguing, contesting, awarding, and doing or exacting *right*: hence δίκη as claim, plea, litigation, judgement, and satisfaction (redress) or retribution (punishment). On the other hand, θέμις seems to start from a notion of *adjudication*, by 'dooms', at least ostensibly based on custom and precedents. The two words converge in meaning, θέμις towards 'law according to right' and δίκη towards 'right according to law'. If true, this history would explain why the social, moral δίκη is more fruitful in the progress of ethics than the juridic, procedural (cf. *Il.* xxiii. 581 ff.) θέμις; and also why the latter, but not the former, is in Homer's heaven. Law arises out of a notion, or practice, of right. But in systems elaborated by states great or small we hardly need to be told today how frail the link between law

and right may be. In such conditions the age-old ideal of right at length reasserts itself, in a new form, as in Hesiod's philosophy and apotheosis of Δίκη. But already in Homer Themis, the personification of order in the forum and in forensic adjudication, is found also as Zeus' minister of order in the assembly or banquet of the gods. In Greek theology law and order in and under the gods is an earlier and easier concept than divine morality.

Since I have given so much space to these conjectures on the conjectural but critical period of Greek jurisprudence, I must emphasize that they would but increase the force and unity of the author's picture of the history of right in Greece. Apart from a few questionable details (e.g. in his otherwise excellent classifications of the use of θέμις, δίκη, and certain other moral terms in Homer, Hesiod, and the earlier lyricists) that picture is drawn with great skill and truth. From Homer and Hesiod he passes to the early Tyrants, the Lawgivers, and written law, adding a useful account of 'heiresses' in Athens and Gortyn. Turning to elegy and iambic he protests with characteristic vigour and good sense against modern theories of Ionian decadence based on a few lines of Mimnermus: 'This categorical verdict is still more ridiculous when passed upon a whole race, these same Ionians who right up to the Persian wars were the leading Greeks in colonization, poetry, philosophy, history, and medical knowledge.' Then follow illuminating discussions on Solon, the ethical influence of Mysteries and Orphism, the Seven Sages and Aesop, the rise of Ionian science and philosophy, and the reconciliation of piety and rationalism attempted by Stesichorus, foreshadowing Pindar and the Tragedians. The problem of Theognis inevitably occupies much space, but we cannot be ungrateful for a clear and extensive review of the literature of the subject. (The book contains many such valuable reviews.) Finally, there is a slight account of Anacreon and Simonides under what the author calls the Indian Summer of Tyranny. There are

four indexes (Books, Classical Quotations, Names, and Greek Words). I know nothing similar in English on this important subject, and I think the book

should be welcomed by all students of Greek thought.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

MARXVS DIXIT: ITA EST

George THOMSON: *Studies in Ancient Greek Society: the Prehistoric Aegean*. Pp. 622; 85 figures, 17 tables, 12 maps. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1949. Cloth, £2. 2s. net.

THIS book treats of a variety of subjects, anthropology, prehistory, mythology, and the early history of poetry, with especial reference to the development of Epic. The first of these divisions, approximately the first nine of the seventeen chapters into which the book is divided, reminds the reviewer not unpleasantly of a long-past youth; if indeed, as the author seems to imply, it is the kind of doctrine current behind the 'iron curtain', it would appear that other things besides their economics are attached to obsolete theories and methods in that region. Here we find a large selection of the once familiar assumptions and hasty conclusions from insufficient evidence which were popular about the beginning of this century and somewhat earlier. 'Totemism', says the author (p. 36), 'is the magico-religious system characteristic of tribal society.' Again (p. 46), 'The name is a totemic survival, and therefore magical', the context making it clear that this dictum is meant to be valid universally and not only for certain areas. Still more significant, because it goes back to the days before Frazer had completed his researches into totemism, is the sweeping statement on p. 50, 'The totem is attended with prayer and propitiation, assumes human shape, and becomes a god.' Here and in many places, again, we find the familiar confusion between totemism and theriolatry. Further, on the very next page (51), the author falls into a too common confusion between a religious or magico-religious prohibition and an economic phenomenon. The reluctance of some pastoral peoples to kill any of their cattle is, as Paul Einzig has pointed out

(*Primitive Money*, p. 126), to be associated with the fact that cattle are their only currency, or at least their chief visible symbol of wealth, and their rich men hoard cattle as misers elsewhere hoard gold or banknotes. Passing from totemism to more general problems of relationship, the author (pp. 60 ff.) discusses the classificatory system with considerable knowledge of the facts but hazardous reasoning. He upholds (pp. 66 f.) the existence of primitive promiscuity and reasons from group-nomenclature to the existence of actual group-marriage (not mere access to a group of persons of the opposite sex), a slenderly and doubtfully attested custom. On the other hand, I believe him to be right when he finds (pp. 79 ff.) traces of group-nomenclature in the Wiro languages and especially in Latin. Again, his treatment of the phenomenon of mother-right (he calls it 'matriarchy', a word which died out of the scientific vocabulary long ago) is a threshing of chopped and very dry straw. He finds it (especially pp. 149 ff.) in the classical areas, using not only the well-worn old arguments which I disposed of many years ago (*Folk-Lore*, xxii. 277-91, 493; xxxi. 93-108; xxxvii. 213-44), but some new ones (pp. 145 f.) which do not impress me. Incidentally, he seems to think that it goes with a high social position of women, a fallacy which should not have survived J. H. Ronsboon's researches (*Women in Primitive Mother-right Societies*, 1931). The 'matriarchal deities' who are discussed in chapter vii are simply goddesses more or less connected with the activities and physiological functions of women, while the preceding chapter, on 'the making of a goddess', over-simplifies by exaggerating the importance of one element which undoubtedly has contributed to such complex figures, viz. the magical procedure connected with menstruation,

childbirth, and other specifically female phenomena. Chapter viii ('The Land') deals not unreasonably with some well-known evidence tending to show that communal ownership, or rather trusteeship, of the soil lingered on long enough in Greece and neighbouring countries to leave traces in our documents. The material is familiar enough, the interpretation at times somewhat doubtful; for example, I am in no way convinced that when Themistokles persuaded the Athenians not to share the surplus from the mines of Laureion among themselves but to spend it on a navy he had anything so ancient as 'old tribal customs' (p. 330) to overcome. Indeed, the author has an unfortunate tendency, not peculiar to him, to jump far too quickly from the savage conditions which no doubt once existed in the Aegean to the relatively high cultures which are found there from our earliest articulate tradition. Chapter ix ('Man's Lot in Life') emphasizes a point too apt to be forgotten, that *μοῖρα* and its cognates mean originally nothing so abstract as fate or destiny but simply the allotted portion of the individual or group concerned. That this began with the specialization of functions which sooner or later comes to every society as it grows more complex may be true but is perhaps again a case of over-simplification. Other things than work may be assigned or dealt out. 'Matriarchal' goddesses are somewhat prone to haunt this chapter. In dealing with 'the formation of towns' (chap. x) nothing very new is said.

A new section of the book begins with chapter xi ('The Mycenaean Dynasties'), followed by chapters on 'The Achaeans' and 'The Clash of Cultures'. Here, by a method perfectly legitimate in itself, archaeology and saga are combined in an attempt to get a relatively complete picture of the periods in question. The weak point is the author's use and interpretation of mythology. Confidence in his judgement is not increased, for instance, when he finds in Danaë's prison 'a faint memory of the Shaft Graves [of Mycenae], confused with the custom of secluding girls at

puberty' (p. 383), nor by the strange medley of Pindar, his scholiast, and Hyginus which is offered (p. 403) as the legend of Pelops and his ivory shoulder. In general, he seems not to realize how much Greek legends were altered, not only from place to place, but from age to age, not least under the hands of systematizers, early and late. For instance, the misty figure of Pleisthenes, who is styled 'a puzzle' on p. 409, is most likely due to someone who wanted to claim Pelopid descent and could not trace his ancestry to any known member of the family. When, in chapter xiii, 'the clash of cultures' is examined, some rather hazardous statements mar the handling of an interesting theme. Thus, Priam's household is declared (p. 417) to be an example of 'matriarchal endogamy', because it includes his son-in-law. But we never see Priam's palace under peace-time conditions, but only during the siege, when Ilium was the only tolerably safe place for any friend of its hard-pressed king. Priam himself is said, on the previous page, to be mild and unwarlike; mild he indeed is, but he is unwarlike only because he is old; in his younger days he was worthy of his epithet *ἐνυμελής*. On the other hand, the author is to be commended for refusing to see in the Achaian gentry such models of 'Victorian' family life and conduct generally as some scholars of that time pronounced them to be (p. 415). But I fail entirely to find in the *Odyssey* the 'tensions and contradictions which marked the transition from mother-right to father-right' which Thomson discovers there (p. 425).

The fifth and last part of the book is entitled simply 'Homer', and consists of four interesting, if contentious, chapters, discussing topics which range from the origins of metre to the rise and fall of epic poetry. Chapter xiv ('The Art of Poetry') goes over fairly familiar ground, treating especially of the connexion of the earliest attempts at rhythmical and musical diction with kindred fields of work and magic. In chapter xv 'the ritual origins of Greek epic' are discussed, and, in the reviewer's opinion, nothing like a case

for the implied proposition is made out, unless all poems are to be called 'ritual' which may on occasion be performed at a religious festival. Once more the preoccupation with everything 'matri-archal' comes to the fore; I much doubt, for instance, if an expert in ecclesiastical costume would support the contention on p. 486 that Christian priests wear a kind of female dress. This is not the only sort of doubtful statement; as an example of what can only be called carelessness I may cite p. 499, where the question put by Kalchas to Mopsos (Strabo, xiv. i. 27) is called a riddle. Chapter xvi treats of 'archaeology and linguistics', without adding much to what has already been said by many writers on these topics; the author supposes the Epic dialect to be in its origin simply Achaian. Incidentally, it is not 'generally agreed', although it no doubt has been held by some scholars, along with almost every other conceivable view, that 'the rape of Helen is founded on ritual' (p. 514). This chapter and the next (xvii, 'The Homeridai') have naturally to deal with

the well-worn dispute between unitarian and separatist concerning Homer. The author tries, partly in the light of the researches of the lamented Milman Parry, to hold the balance between them, but, in addition to making the familiar mistake (p. 563) that the Hymn to Apollo says Homer was a blind Chian, would appear (p. 571) still to believe in the Peisistratean recension, in the 'creative power' of the Homeridai as a body, and in a 'plastic' *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which could be freely modified. My faith is not so robust. He does, however, make a good suggestion to explain the contradictory views concerning the amount of poetry to be attributed to Homer himself which we find at various dates; they are, he thinks (p. 558), the fruit of a double tradition, that of the Homeridai themselves and that of independent critics.

In short, this μέγα βιβλίον, if not exactly μέγα κακόν, contains a far smaller proportion of matter worth reading than would justify its bulk.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE PERSIAN EMPIRE

A. T. OLMSTEAD: *The History of the Persian Empire*. Pp. xx+576; 70 plates, 11 maps. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1949. Cloth, 55s. net.

THOUGH Professor Olmstead did not live to see this book published, it has been carefully edited by his colleague Professor G. G. Cameron, whose *History of Early Iran* (1936) makes a detailed account of prehistoric conditions superfluous. It can therefore begin and end with the Achaemenid dynasty. Further relief is afforded by the author's *History of Palestine and Syria* (1931), though Persian dealings with the restored Jewish community are recorded briefly in their place.

What makes this book notable and welcome is its combination of all the divers materials, which have recently been immensely amplified by excavation and especially by the work of the Chicago Oriental Institute at Perse-

polis. Even now not all the inscriptions from Persepolis are published, but the revelation of Persian life and administration is impressive. We miss, however, a comparative study of the capital cities, in their respective geographical settings and seasonal functions, as we have it in Vaughan Cornish's *Capital Cities*. In truth the capital of the Persian Empire was wherever the King of Kings happened to be; as in Ezra's tale of the mislaid charter.

Only less revealing is the record of Persian affairs in Egypt; for the last native dynasty, while it lasted, rivalled the Twenty-Sixth in its efficiency and artistic achievements; and the archives of the Jewish mercenaries are a running commentary on the whole period of Persian interference. Frequent use is made, too, of the monuments and coin-types of Carian and Lycian dynasts and Persian satraps, with their remarkable portraits and adaptations of Greek cult-types,

illustrating on a small scale the same frontier problems as the collisions with provincial and independent Greeks.

In the light of these and other kinds of indirect evidence, copious use of the minor Greek writers need not surprise. Ctesias is at his worst in describing Greek history, which he did not understand; at his best, like Xenophon in his *Cyrus*, when he reflects incidents and customs of daily occurrence. Diodorus, relying on Ephorus, becomes the more valuable after the testimony of *Helanica* fails: Plutarch's *Artaxerxes* has at least some contemporary sources and an encyclopaedic flair for cultures and characters. Not least useful is the nearly contemporary 'rogues' calendar' in ps.-Aristotle's *Economica*, now that so many of its *σοφίσματα* can be dated.

Useful chapters are those on economics, religion, and the progress of science, dealing with the vast Babylonian heritage of Persia, and the reasons for its very partial and late transmission to the West; and conversely with the limits within which the western provinces of the Empire were being hellenized before Alexander. There might have been fuller discussion of the relations of the older Greek cities with the provincial administration, and an estimate of the dependence of western satraps on Greek mercenaries.

Inevitably the western frontier and its Greek relations receive full attention. It is interesting—and stimulating—to have the familiar stories retold from the 'enemy's' point of view, and linked with other problems of Persian administration. The conversion of Socrates, a pupil of the Milesian physicist Archelaus, from Ionian physical to Attic ethical philosophy, and the rejection at Athens of the teaching of Anaxagoras, have a significance like that of the naval and military repulse of Xerxes.

This large Greece-ward aspect of Persian history is, however, made difficult to appreciate by the author's firm belief that it was the democratic movement in Greek states, and especially in Athens, which was Persia's friend and collaborator, and Sparta with its nor-

mal associates which was the core of nationalist resistance. The first mission from Athens to Artaphernes is assumed to have been typical—though it was promptly repudiated at home; Mar-donius' deposition of the outmoded 'tyrants' of Ionia is treated as a glimpse of Persian higher policy; Marathon was the victory 'not of the *demos* but of Miltiades and his oligarch friends; the 'democracy under Themistocles' was ready to join hands with 'democracy's patron' Xerxes if the Spartans withdrew to the Isthmus; even Pericles, in spite of the Samian War, was working for a positive agreement with Persia—a new light on the so-called 'Peace of Callias' and the Argive mission to Susa. There was indeed a 'natural friendship between Athens and Persia' (388, 393). Conversely Sparta's persistent failure to defend Persia's victims oversea is rather lamely excused, as well as the later attempts to gain Persian help against Athens. But as full references are given throughout, the careful reader can form his own estimate of this theory.

There are minor questions not unconnected with it. In what sense was Aegina democratic? or was Eretria the mother-city of Athens? (p. 160). Was Thessaly pro-Persian, apart from the exiled Aleuadae? (250). Xerxes is given high praise as an administrator, on unpublished evidence from Persepolis (272): it was Mycale, not Plataea, that ruined his hopes in the West. The Delian League is contrasted with the persistent 'Hellenic League' of Pausanias (264). Another oddity is Megalopolis 'surprisingly modern' (434): surely it is Washington that inherits from Thales (Hdt. i. 170). Yet there is a favourable estimate of Herodotus, as traveller and inquirer (317): many of his stories are deemed to be genuinely oriental.

The long series of plates includes many views of Persepolis and its reliefs, and fine illustrations of Iranian landscape. Some curious spellings of Greek proper names, repeated in the index, should be corrected in a later impression.

JOHN L. MYRES.

HELLAS

Martin VAN DEN BRUWAENE: *Le Miracle grec. L'Orient préclassique jusqu'à l'époque de Démosthène*. Pp. 394; 100 ill. Brussels: L'Édition Universelle, 1947. Paper.

FIRST a word of apology is due for the long delay in the writing of this review. The book differs somewhat from the usual single-volume history of Hellas in its attempt to combine completeness with precision, to be at once a general history of a whole civilization and a student's companion. A conspectus of the Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Creto-Mycenaean background is well integrated with what follows, and the history of abstract thought, art, and religion is woven into the fabric of Hellenic politics. Summaries of political and juridical institutions and clear definitions of terms are given with remarkable economy. Generalization and precise quotation of literary and monumental sources are happily knit together, but it is noteworthy that, though this is a primer, the author takes for granted the reader's knowledge of the primary sources, literary and material. A chapter on these would have been helpful. This is an easy book to read, and from it a novice could acquire without tears the essential background to the fifth and sixth centuries B.C.—the fourth is briefly dismissed. Yet the account of the fifth century manages to be remarkably inadequate and gives the impression of lack of profundity in the author's own studies. It is apparent that the Great Century is not studied on the Continent with that passionate probing intensity that is characteristic of the English school. Of course no scholar expects to agree in detail with another's interpretation of the fifth century, but this book contains too many improbable or false statements and implications.

Of these the treatment of Pericles as the actual master of Athens (for thirty years!), before whom all opposition hid its head, is the most irritating. 'Le pouvoir . . . est occupé par un stratège': one and only one. What would Myronides, Tolmides, Cimon returned, the

elder Thucydides, and the restless spirits of Plutarch *Pericles* 20 have said to that? Thucydides' phrase about the *πρώτος ἀνὴρ* is being sadly overworked nowadays, though here we are spared the comparison of Pericles to Augustus; few will believe in this connexion that Sophocles *Antigone* 737 and 525 contain criticism of Pericles and Aspasia. Then the view of Cimon as leader of the 'oligarchs' and an opponent of imperialism is quite out of focus. The account of the Delian League contains some odd statements, as that the tribute was additional to the provision of ships by each city, and hence that the substitution of ship-money for service was an *extra* charge. Lack of thought alone could account for the statement that 50,000 *Athenians* perished in Egypt. How many men of military age would that leave at Athens? To remark that Archidamus *instigated* the Peloponnesian War is odd, in view of Thucydides; to attribute such a view to Professor Adcock odder still. The hapless Nicias was certainly not in favour of 'peace at any price'; he was far removed from the small set to whom alone, at a much later date, Thucydides attributes that desire.

As for constitutional matters, there are some strange remarks and omissions concerning the *Στρατηγία*; its dependence on the Council is not sufficiently indicated. Ostracism is rightly seen as an amelioration of the custom of banishment, but it is not correct to state that ostracism ended a man's career for ever. Not so for Aristides or Cimon, nor in his own evident expectation for Themistocles.

The treatment of Sparta has similar weaknesses. Neither the early evolution of the constitution nor the gradual transformation of the City into a 'military camp' is properly outlined. We hear of Terpander and Tyrtaeus, but neither of Alcman nor of the significant discoveries at the shrine of Artemis Orthia. Justice is not done to Spartan statecraft before and during the reign of Cleomenes, though the

importance of the creation of the Peloponnesian League is recognized. In the account of the Persian Wars the 'crowning mercy' of Plataea is omitted and Athens is given the sole glory of saving Hellas. Of Sparta's fourth-century achievements at least the *anabasis* of Agesilaus should have been mentioned.

M. van den Bruwaene is often unhappy in his omissions, and sometimes makes wild statements, as that the Thebans and Thessalians were Dorians. He manages to be old-fashioned the wrong way. He is well enough acquainted with modern French and German scholarship, though very inadequately with English historians and American epigraphists; Meritt and Wade-Gery are not even names to him. Otherwise the

select bibliographies of each chapter are useful enough. The fault, however, lies not in his reading but in himself. He has not made the subject his own, he has not soaked himself in the material, and hence he has accepted without challenge easy and fashionable generalizations.

The volume is well printed on decent paper; the illustrations are just tolerable. There are some misprints: Chori-laos (p. 100), 431 B.C. (p. 308) for the Peace of Nicias. But the dating of the Megarian Decrees just after 446 B.C. (p. 298) is a slip of another order. So, too, the attribution of *thermes* to fifth-century Athens (p. 316).

A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE

St. John's College, Oxford.

CATO MAIOR

E. V. MARMORALE: *Cato Maior*. Pp. 267.

Bari: Laterza, 1949. Paper, L. 800.

FRANCESCO DELLA CORTE: *Catone Censore, la Vita e la Fortuna*. Pp. 190. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 1949. Paper, L. 1,600.

THE first edition of Marmorale's *Cato Maior* was published in 1944 and was reviewed by A. Bernardi in *Paideia* (i, 1946, pp. 116 ff.); to this review M. replied with some spirit in *Paideia* ii (1947), and he has now reprinted this reply as a preface to his second edition. Since the main point which he seeks to maintain against criticism is his interpretation of Cato's political life and since he regards this as 'tutto il succo del mio libro', it must claim first place and can be briefly summarized. After some general observations on the theme that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, with which all must agree, he draws a picture of Cato as the defender of liberty against the first symptoms of 'cesarismo' which he finds personified in Scipio Africanus: Cato the Republican and anti-imperialist against Scipio imperialist and would-be dictator (incidentally the Gracchi are tarred with the same brush: aspirants to tyranny in the guise of defenders of the people: p. 242).

This thesis cannot be accepted, and

for one simple reason: M. makes virtually no attempt to base it on the ancient authorities and he assumes rather than tries to prove it. (He does refer to Seneca, *Epist.* 86. 1-3 and Livy xxxviii. 50. 8, but without critical discussion.) It would have helped his case to refer to the speech of Ti. Gracchus ('eum perpetuum consulem et dictatorem vellet facere': Livy xxxviii. 56) and attempt to prove its authenticity, but of this not a word, nor any reasoned defence of the reliability of Valerius Antias as an historian which such an attempt would require, nor any reference to the striking remarks of Polybius (x. 40. 9) about Scipio and monarchy. True, Scipio's outstanding personal leadership and his continued proconsular and consular commands may point the way to the Roman Empire, but that does not prove that he himself ever aimed at dictatorship in Rome.

The general problem cannot be discussed here, but it may be well to glance at M.'s thesis in a practical light. When was Scipio a danger to the Republic, or when could he have been? Surely the answer must be: only immediately after Zama when he had a devoted and victorious army (although even so his political position in Rome at this time had been seriously challenged by the

Servilii and other noble families). But if tempted then, Scipio resisted and retired into private life; and in any case Cato, then only *quaestorius*, hardly comes into the picture so early. M.'s thesis implies that Scipio was a danger in 187, but by then his brother had been successfully superseded and he was again without military power. Naturally Cato had a great part in bringing Scipio to his knees or rather to disdainful withdrawal from Rome, but his motive may not have been Scipio's alleged 'Fascist' tendencies. In any case rival noble families played their part in the overthrow: the *novus homo* was not alone in his dislike of Scipio.

Many other interrelated questions arise which have not been tackled by M. in detail. Was Scipio a militarist and aggressive imperialist? (De Sanctis judged so, but others have thought otherwise.) If so, what is the evidence? What was his real position in the years between Zama and his downfall? Cato was clearly an anti-expansionist, but to what extent can he justly be called an anti-imperialist? The views of the Carthaginians might well differ from those of the Rhodians on this question, while the Celtiberian estimate of Cato might not have been so flattering as the Macedonian assessment. Many might judge Scipio's brand of imperialism less deadly than Cato's anti-imperialism: had Carthage more freedom after the Third than after the Second Punic War?

The reason for raising such matters here (and discussion is obviously impossible) is that M. himself has underlined his belief in his main thesis and its centrality to his book. Apart from this it may be said that he has written a pleasant and straightforward account of Cato's life and works. Some two-thirds of the book gives a 'biobibliografia' (the notes in the second edition having been wisely transferred to the foot of the page); the last part sketches Cato *agricola, orator, historicus, and civis et magistratus*. In many controversial matters M. wisely follows the lead of P. Fraccaro, whose work in this field is magisterial. His deviations are not always preferable, for instance he

prefers De Sanctis' reconstruction of the 'trial' of Africanus (which has the weakness of rejecting the evidence of our primary authority, Polybius), and he wrongly places his death before 184. (The argument that because Cato as censor named Valerius Flaccus as Princeps Senatus, Scipio must have vacated the position by death before the censorship, is not valid, because the new Princeps may have been named any time before the end of the censorship, i.e. half-way through 183.) M. does full justice to Cato's oratory and quotes extensively from the fragments of his speeches, though he takes a low view of Cato as an historian. Apart from this, Cato's better points are fully appreciated: the warts are not prominent.

The emphasis of F. Della Corte's book is slightly different. In the first third he sketches Cato's life and achievements; in the rest he writes on 'La fortuna' and discusses systematically and in detail the passages of ancient literature which deal with Cato's life and the attitude of their authors to him. This is most useful. The first part is straightforward; like M., he often follows Fraccaro on many debatable points and makes ample use of the fragments of the speeches. Besides depicting the well-known Cato, he also attempts to lift a corner of the curtain that may veil a changing Cato, the powerful 'capitalist' in Rome who developed from the plain countryman of earlier days, and the accompanying alteration in his outlook, of which we get hints in Plutarch.

The general result of the second part may be summarized: Polybius probably appreciated Cato's gifts, though certainly not without reservations. The Sullan annalists later developed the theme of the rivalry of Cato and Scipio, Valerius Antias being more hostile to Africanus, Claudius Quadrigarius creating the harsh picture of an envenomed Cato. Then, a century after Cato's death, his fortunes revived, thanks to his great-grandson Uticensis and to Cicero's idealizing of the old man in *De Senectute*. Cicero, intent on composing an idyll of earlier Roman life, in which there was greater *concordia* among politicians, obscured

the opposition of Cato and the Scipios and preferred to dwell on the cordial relations of Cato and Scipio Aemilianus. Nepos, however, in his two biographies of Cato, did not blink the fact of earlier bitterness. Livy was not influenced by Cicero's portrait; though with his admiration of Republican liberty he had a strong sympathy for Cato and regarded him as a watchdog against the nobility, yet in following the Sullan annalists he gives a less flattering portrait and found Cato lacking in *magnitudo animi*. Plutarch was faced with a mass of contradictory material: unfavourable writings, partly by Greeks who painted Cato as a rough and aggressive countryman, others, like Cicero's philosophic dialogue, which put Cato in a philhellenic setting, cultured and learned. Using many of the anecdotes which circulated about Cato, Plutarch, who admired him but was nevertheless a Greek, gave life to his portrait which established the figure of the stern censor, Stoic in conduct, for centuries.

There is much interesting material collected and discussed here, and much material for debate, e.g. the extent of contemporary references in the poets of Cato's day, or the influence of Xenophon

on Cato, or the question of Plutarch's sources (the view of R. E. Smith, *C.Q.* 1940, that Plutarch used a biography of Cato which was arranged chronologically, is rejected, and della Corte reverts to the belief, put forward as possible but improbable by Leo, that Plutarch derived in part from Polybius).

The activities of Cato have been summarized in the encomia by Nepos, Livy, and Pliny: *agricola, iurisconsultus, imperator, orator, cupidissimus litterarum*, and in both these books there emerges a lively portrait of Cato in some of these capacities. More perhaps might have been said about his position in Roman historiography (in relation to Gelzer's work on the Greek histories by Roman senators and the Roman annalistic tradition), while Cato the politician is too isolated a figure. We see the man himself, sniping now at one, now at another member of the nobility, but no serious attempt is made to depict the real nature of Roman political life with its continual tensions between factions of noble families, together with the position of a *novus homo* in this ever-changing scene.

H. H. SCULLARD.

King's College, London.

PARTY POLITICS AT ROME

Lily Ross TAYLOR: *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. (Sather Classical Lectures, vol. xxii.) Pp. x+255. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1949. Cloth, \$3.50.

THIS is a vigorous and scholarly study both of techniques and of incidents in late Republican politics, for which Professor Taylor prepared the ground in recent articles (*C.P.* xxxvi and xxxvii, *A.J.P.* lxiii, and *T.A.P.A.* lxxiii). Particularly in the early chapters on the nature of the *factio* and *partes* and on the resources used by Roman politicians she presents the evidence attractively and makes a satisfying attempt to get inside the mind of the age. Such doubts as are expressed below are intended only as a tribute to a stimulating book.

In a closely knit chapter on the Roman voting system Miss Taylor studies some of the points made by Hugh Last in *A.J.P.* lviii, 1937, p. 467 (review of F. B. Marsh). She is unconvinced, however, about the strength of the city voters in the rural tribes, comparing these tribes with the urban on the basis of *I.L.S.* 6046, an inscription which enumerates, by tribes, certain corn-recipients at an unknown imperial date (p. 200). But Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, iii. 446, n. 3) believed that the totals given on this inscription were only one-fifteenth of the *plebs frumentaria*; and if he was right, the figures 68 and 85 given for the only two rural tribes mentioned might be as significant for their absolute size as for their obvious inferiority to the figures for the urban tribes. For they would mean that the

average rural tribe had at least 1,100 men resident in Rome at that date; and if such figures have any value for the age of Cicero, they would suggest that a formidable crowd of country voters, perhaps 30,000, would have had to go to Rome to capture the rural tribes in the *comitia tributa* on any issue on which the city voters were solid. In any case, as Last pointed out, politicians of various types believed 'urbanam plebem nimium in re publica posse' (Cic. *Leg. Agr.* ii. 70), and this probably applied to voting strength as well as to nuisance value. T. is unduly discouraged by tendentious passages like Cic. *Sest.* 109, though she, too, ultimately concludes that the country voters, apart from their use in the *comitia centuriata*, could act decisively only on special occasions and at tribunician elections, as in the events of 58-57 which are admirably described (pp. 60-2). Indeed, given that Pompey can fairly be credited with the mobilization of *cuncta Italia* on that occasion, she might well have here recalled her view that by restoring the censors in 70 Pompey had aimed at dressing the balance of the Italians in his behalf (p. 52); this suggestion is apparently forgotten in most of her chapter, which assumes that the use of country voters remained principally a weapon of the *boni*. Finally it is hard to agree that the 'Transpadanes' enfranchised by the *Lex Roscia* increased the citizen rolls by 50 per cent. (p. 173), however much such an estimate might help to explain the census figures for 28 B.C.

In an account of the sixties which is so fully abreast of modern research it is surprising to find no mention of the probable Pompeian alliance of the early Catiline (see esp. M. Gelzer, *R.-E.* s.v. 'Sergius' (23), coll. 1693 ff.). How long this continued is a question, but the defence of Catiline by Torquatus (Cic. *Sull.* 81) deserved explanation, even though Miss Taylor holds relatively traditionalist views about the 'conspiracy' of 66-65 (p. 123). It is still more pertinent to complain of the description of Crassus as a 'middle-of-the-road man' (p. 222). Of what road? The suggestion that he favoured the com-

promise achieved over the courts in 70 is not unattractive, but the remarks made about his alliances in the next ten years would have greater force without this return to the concepts of Right and Left. Nor is it clear why the relations between Cicero and Crassus, otherwise acutely analysed, are admitted to have been bad for 'at least a decade before late 55' (p. 228). *Simultates partim obscurae* in *Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 71 might refer to anyone; Crassus of course supported Cicero's opponents in 64, but the inconclusive evidence for their relations in 63 is well enough known; and so we reach *Plut. Crass.* 13. But is not the real question whether Crassus had made any bid for a unique position with the *equites* before 61, and whether it was not in that year that Cicero's *officium* was *interruptum*? A still more important point about this part of the period concerns Pompey. Exemplary use in other connexions is made of *Comm. Pet.* 5, but the most obvious significance of Q. Cicero's advice is ignored when we are told that in the following year, 63, 'Pompey was the man that the *optimates* hated and feared most' (p. 120). Cicero on the Rullan Bill used to the Senate not far different arguments about Pompey from those he used to the people (cf. also *Cat. iv.* 21). Perhaps the Senate were foolish, probably they were far from unanimous, but the desire to forget the past with Pompey seems to have been strong once the battles of 67 and 66 had been lost.

On pp. 112 ff. the suggestion is made that Cicero after his successful prosecution acquired Verres' praetorian status. This cannot be demonstrably disproved, for Cic. *Balb.* 57 and Dio xxxvi. 40 (possibly also Cic. *Sull.* 32) show that such a reward was possible at this period. But Dio implies that the procedure was exceptional, and this interpretation presumably goes back to a Republican source, given the relative frequency of such *praemia* under the Principate. It is then curious that the source did not cite the example of Cicero if it was available.

Miss Taylor's account of the period preceding the Civil War is marked by

her acceptance of the second Sallustian *Suasoria* as a document of the year 51. This is not the place for a discussion of that problem, though she makes not negligible contributions to it on pp. 232 ff. It is enough to say that her consequent rewriting of these years is logically done and well worth pondering even by those who reject the premiss. More argument was needed on the political affiliations of Metellus Scipio in 52 before it was assumed that he was unacceptable not only to Cato personally but to his faction; and it is far from clear that the bearing of Pompey's legislation in that year is correctly interpreted. The statement (p. 149) that Pompey held 'proconsular power, not, under the laws, to be combined with the consulate' needs analysis, and

the extension from 52 of his *imperium* in Spain is not necessarily (in spite of Dio) an instance in which he was 'suarum legum auctor idem ac subversor'. It would be wise to examine the language Caesar himself used in his complaints (esp. *B.C.* i. 85).

This is a peculiarly enjoyable volume of Sather lectures. For the many students who are going to profit from it a summary of the extensive bibliography used would have been valuable, and perhaps also an index of the ancient passages discussed. Among minor slips I noticed an imaginary 'extreme decree' of 91 B.C. (p. 18), '75' for '55' (p. 59). 'T. Munatius Plancius Bursa' (*passim*) and 'Modigliani' for 'Momigliano' (p. 216).

G. E. F. CHILVER.

The Queen's College, Oxford.

ROMAN BRITAIN

M. P. CHARLESWORTH: *The Lost Province, or The Worth of Britain*. Pp. vii+89; 2 maps. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

ALL readers of Mr. Charlesworth's work know the particular and characteristic charm with which he can evoke the feeling of life in the Roman world. No doubt everyone's impression of what life in the Roman world, or in different corners of it, really was like is to some extent personal; but Mr. Charlesworth's evocation is at least based on a scholarship and on an acquaintance with the findings of archaeology which are at once wide and deep.

This little book, the Gregynog Lectures for 1947-8, challenges comparison especially with the author's Martin Lectures, published under the title of *Five Men*; and readers of that book will find that *The Lost Province* will not disappoint them. They will find the same mastery of detail (there will be few indeed who have not something to learn here) expressed in the same easy style; though the reviewer may confess to one disappointment, having supposed after a glance at the title that Mr. Charlesworth had found Valentia.

The first two of the four lectures give a brief but extraordinarily suggestive

and informative historical outline of the conquest and Romanization of Britain, followed by a sketch of the relations of Romans and provincials, especially in the fourth and fifth centuries, where our very ignorance gives the subject the attraction of mystery. Then follow discussions of 'What Rome Gained from Britain' (chiefly on economics) and of 'What We Have Gained from the Roman Occupation', in which much is made of the evidence of direct borrowing from Latin in the Germanic languages and also (appropriately to the setting of these lectures) in Welsh.

A number of slips, of a kind which it is much easier to notice when reviewing than to avoid when writing, appear, chiefly in the earlier pages. The Catuvelauni, not the Trinovantes (p. 7), were the dominant tribe in south-east Britain in 43; Corbridge is on the Tyne, not on the 'north Tyne' (p. 9); the legion withdrawn in the eighties was II Adiutrix, not XIV, which had left in 70 (p. 11). The frontier in 83 was (as Mr. Charlesworth knows very well) from about Perth to Glasgow, not from Carlisle to Newcastle (p. 39); the 8,000 legionaries from Britain who fought for Vitellius in 69 were not used 'to reinforce the depleted legions' (p. 44) but fought under

their own colours (Tac. *Hist.* iii. 22); and the Battle of Lugdunum was in 197 (as given on p. 18) not in 193 (p. 47).

On matters of more importance it is surely not surprising that 'Romans and Britons were intermarrying' (p. 31) in the third to fifth centuries; the Britons *were* Romans by that time, as St. Patrick (there quoted) emphasizes; and for that matter, already in the first century a British lady 'whose ancestors wore woad', married to a Roman officer, was acquitting herself creditably in Roman polite society (Martial xi. 53). Again, Britain was surely never a net asset to the Roman army. The 18 regiments, or 12,000 men, cited on p. 43, are certainly 'a very respectable figure', but leave—even with an ample allowance for units still unknown and for Britons serving in Britain—a serious

debit balance, when compared with the 70 or so cohorts and *alae*, plus three legions, which Rome had to maintain here.

But these are details. The book as a whole will delight both scholars and laymen. It will be of particular value to the reader embarking on the advanced study of Roman Britain, who will find the highly selective bibliography an invaluable guide to what is best worth reading among the voluminous and scattered modern material. In conclusion a word of praise must be given to the excellent folding map of Roman Wales, and one of congratulation to the University Press on an admirable piece of printing and book-production.

A. R. BURN.

University of Glasgow.

BYZANTINE EGYPT

Allan Chester JOHNSON and Louis C. WEST: *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*. (Princeton Studies in Papyrology, No. 6.) Pp. viii + 344. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.

THIS volume does for Byzantine Egypt what Prof. Johnson's *Roman Egypt* did for the earlier period, and the comparative neglect of the Byzantine age by papyrologists makes it even more welcome. It follows the same general plan as its predecessor. It falls into four main sections, land, people, defence, and taxation. As in the former volume, lists of documents are given under the various headings, e.g. sales and leases of land, besides such lists as those of building materials (p. 109, where under 'fired brick' P.Oxy. 2197 is omitted), pottery, drugs, prices, etc., and on pp. 297–321 an alphabetical list of miscellaneous taxes. These are to the researcher perhaps the most valuable feature of the volume. The authors cover the ground with admirable thoroughness, giving evidence on every page of wide reading and acquaintance with all the sources, papyrological, legal, and literary. They write objectively, and

treat with fairness views which they reject. There is no doubt that the volume will be of very great utility, and with reservations it can be recommended as an essential work of reference to every student of Byzantine Egypt.

The reservations are, however, serious. Despite the evidence of extensive research the actual writing seems to have been too hasty. There are many examples of carelessness, even of unscholarly slovenliness, and some blunders which are astonishing in so learned a work, some of them apparently due to the unchecked use of rough notes. This probably explains the baffling statement (p. 71), 'Arian is said to have persecuted the monastic institutions of Egypt'. Who, one asks, was Arian? An obscure emperor? An unrecorded prefect? A reference to Socrates and Sozomen in the footnote shows that 'the Arians' are meant. Some linguistic insensitiveness may at times be suspected, e.g. '*an Aphrodito papyri*' (p. 218) or a form like '*brevium*', apparently an unnecessary back-formation from *βρεούιον*; and some arguments suggest an imperfect critical sense in the use of evidence.

Most of these flaws concern points of detail, but they arouse a feeling of uneasiness, and at times we find more serious blunders. In the Introduction we are told that not more than a dozen documents 'can be definitely dated in the whole fifth century', and that after the fifth 'few documents bear definite dates'. A reference to a manuscript list of dated or datable papyri in the British Museum Department of MSS. (not kept up to date since 1940) shows over eighty which can be assigned to definite years in the fifth century and some 300 in the sixth. Lower down, the extraordinary statement 'Since the Egyptian bishops embraced the Arian heresy, most of their writings have perished', might be a slip of the pen, 'Arian' written for 'monophysite', though even so it is misleading, since the reference is to the whole Byzantine period, and the monophysite schism did not occur till 451; but other passages (pp. 71, 107) reveal the surprising fact that the authors really believe the Egyptian Church to have been Arian.

These defects are regrettable, for the authors advance a novel and interesting view, and accuracy of statement is important. Their thesis is that, contrary to received opinion, Byzantine Egypt 'was prosperous except for some villages on the edge of the Fayum oasis abandoned because the canals . . . had been allowed to silt up' (p. 6), that the peasantry were freer than under Roman rule, and that their lot was 'probably better than in any period' (p. 240).

Where evidence is so incomplete (and often ambiguous), dogmatism is inadmissible; a conscientious reviewer can only confess himself unconvinced. The authors hold that the codes, with their unfavourable evidence, 'present a very biased historical picture'. Is not this a reversal of probabilities? Notoriously, legal codes are unsafe guides to actual conditions. They represent the legislator's intentions; practice is apt to fall below the ideal. But to ask us to believe that Byzantine emperors painted a quite exaggerated picture of social evils and issued edicts to remedy non-existent or unimportant abuses is asking a good

deal. The supporting evidence is not convincing. 'The growth of the great estate in Egypt seems to have begun not through capitalistic investment' [a rather doubtful view] 'but by patronage.' Why did peasant owners have recourse to patronage if they were prosperous? The authors think taxation was not unduly high. Calculations based on Byzantine accounts are hazardous; and in any case we have to allow for all sorts of extra charges and for wholesale corruption. There was 'a vast increase' in bureaucracy (p. 332); this had to be paid for. Nor does the evidence seem to warrant the view that the peasant was freer than in the Roman period; to me it strongly suggests the opposite. I have not space to enter into the complicated question and can only register my profound scepticism.

One or two points may, however, be noted. The authors question current views as to the importance of the Apion estates, declaring that the word *διαφέρειν* applied to a village or hamlet need not imply ownership: 'when a tenant applied for a favor, he need not be taken literally' (p. 54⁴⁰). But many of the documents referred to are not requests for favours; they are routine applications for 'spare parts'. The formulae are stereotyped, but there is one difference: sometimes a place is *παγαρχούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ὑπερφυείας*, sometimes *διαφέρων τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ ὑπερφυείᾳ*. Surely this is deliberate; hence *διαφέρειν* must mean 'belong to'.

On p. 240 the authors, remarking that 'Justinian expected to collect 8 million artabae annually from all Egypt' (except Mareotis and Menelais), whereas Augustus levied only 6 million, and that an Antaeopolite register, as interpreted by them, 'indicates an average rate seemingly lower than that of Roman times', conclude that the arable area had increased; ergo, there was greater prosperity. The always ambiguous testimony of single registers is a flimsy basis for such a conclusion, which flies in the face of definite evidence of desiccation and the abandonment of villages, certainly in the Fayyûm and probably elsewhere.

It must not be supposed from the above that the volume is not a valuable and on the whole a good one. It can, with caution, be cordially recommended. Its utility would have been increased by an index of the many papyri so use-

fully discussed; and, since the authors do not follow the standard method, there should have been a list of abbreviated references.

H. I. BELL.

Aberystwyth.

CONSTANTINE

A. H. M. JONES: *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*. Pp. xiv + 271. London: English Universities Press, 1948. Cloth, 5s. net.

THE purpose of the enterprising 'Teach Yourself History' series in which this volume appears is to 'open up a significant historical theme' by way of a biography of some leading figure. This accounts for the double title, though one feels that a more apposite one could have been found. For Europe was, in fact, predominantly pagan at the death of Constantine. Christianity, even within the Empire, though enjoying imperial favour was as yet no more than a *religio licita*. Half a century was to elapse before it could properly be described as the official religion of the Roman Empire, and another two centuries had passed before the conversion of the West can be said to have started on its final course with Augustine's mission to this country. Such later developments are, save in his concluding pages, rightly disregarded by the author. The background and the achievements of the first Christian emperor are the theme of this carefully planned study, and a title more indicative of its contents, one might suggest, would have been 'Constantine and the End of the Ancient World'.

A modern life of Constantine addressed to the English public is certainly overdue, and it is safe to predict that Professor Jones's monograph will be accepted at once as our standard biography, replacing Firth's volume in the 'Heroes of the Nations' series, now more than forty years old. During the past generation the controversy which Burckhardt originated concerning the nature of Constantine's conversion has broadened and deepened, and general agreement is not yet in sight. Professor

Jones has mastered the new material, and steers a moderate course between the extremes of over-scepticism and unwarranted hypothesis. A valuable feature from the general reader's point of view is the unusually large place given to extracts from the original sources. Essential documents such as those on the Donatist dispute cited by Optatus have sometimes been ignored, and even if taken into account they are seldom translated; the author's renderings of extensive passages both from these and from the imperial edicts and correspondence are a welcome innovation. The complicated changes of ruler which accompanied and followed the tetrarchy are another stumbling-block which Professor Jones has done his best to remove by the provision of two remarkably ingenious maps, which manage to convey a surprising amount of information, together with genealogical and chronological tables.

Three introductory chapters, in which the social, economic, and religious conditions of the later Empire are briefly described, set the stage for the advent to power of the youthful Constantine. These are so good that one is tempted to wish them longer. The immense revolution in Roman life produced by the upheaval of the third century is still generally underestimated, and if the work of Diocletian and Constantine is to be seen in its true perspective a sustained effort is needed to efface from one's mind many familiar features of the classical world. Full treatment, on the other hand, is accorded to the religious policy of the emperor, and the Council of Nicaea with its aftermath, including the vicissitudes of the Melitian schism, forms the centre-piece of the volume. Constantine as *ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτός* is the starting-point for a

discussion of the letter to Sapor and the anti-pagan legislation, and short chapters on secular policy and on the significance of the death-bed baptism lead to the final evaluation of Constantine's place in history.

Neither his character nor his abilities, in Professor Jones's view, justify the title of Great which posterity has bestowed upon Constantine. 'He lacked firmness of purpose to pursue steadily his long-term objectives.' In his ecclesiastical policy 'he had a noble object, the unity of the Church, but in pursuing it he oscillated helplessly between the various parties, now condemning one and now another in alternate fits of rage'. It is difficult to agree wholly with this judgement. The criterion of greatness is surely achievement, and of the achievement of Constantine there can be no doubt. Constantine the waverer, 'un pauvre homme qui tâtonnait' in Piganol's striking phrase, is not easily reconciled with the evidence of his remarkable letters, or with the carefully-timed stages of his legislative attack on the pagan position. From the incomprehension displayed in such instances as the appeal to Alexander and Arius one may indeed suspect that the emperor's views on the nature of Christian dogma, no less than on the problem of Christian unity, underwent notable developments in the course of his career. Yet the aim was constant; it was the methods which were changed to meet changing circumstances.

Despite tactical blunders and set-

backs, his strategy in dealing with the Church authorities cannot be reckoned unsuccessful: at his death only one principal adversary, the indomitable Athanasius, remained finally unreconciled. Comparison with similar efforts made by his successors in the centuries which followed, when every expedient was tried which might secure that unity which the safety of the Empire demanded, might not prove disadvantageous to Constantine. One method—the imperial dictation of religious belief which has sometimes been called 'Caesaropapism'—, though employed on occasion by impatient rulers, never failed to encounter resistance, passive perhaps but ultimately effective, on the part of the Church. 'The breeze', Norman Baynes has well said, 'passes over the ears of wheat and they bend before it; the breeze dies down and the wheat-ears stand as they stood before its coming.' The doctrine of 'Caesaropapism' was never, as Professor Jones claims, 'implicitly accepted' in the Byzantine empire.

It is to be hoped that this book will have the wide circulation which it deserves. The last word on Constantine will perhaps never be said. Sift the conflicting evidence as we will, the final secret of that mysterious personality remains hidden. But as a trustworthy introduction to the problem, and a genuine incentive to further exploration, Professor Jones's excellent little study can be recommended without reserve. H. St.L. B. Moss.

CONSTANTINE'S CHRISTIAN POLICY

Andrew ALFÖLDI: *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*. Translated by Harold Mattingly. Pp. vii+140. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1948. Cloth, 15s. net.

PROFESSOR ALFÖLDI has united and strengthened, in this short and readable volume translated with all Mr. Mattingly's grace and skill, the many threads of Constantinian and Church history which he had previously spun in a variety of learned papers. His object is to review the whole course of Constan-

tine's Christian policy. In particular he emphasizes that C.'s conversion, before the battle of the Mulvian Bridge, was to some extent the result of a former Christian inclination, and that his subsequent application of a Christian policy in his statecraft was deliberately modified in order to avoid an undesirable degree of public offence and political schism. He ranges with authority over a wide field of evidence and research; and although his book is highly subjective in nature, dealing with the his-

tory of ideas (and a sharply isolated set of ideas at that) rather than with any broad and factual stream of C.'s very long reign, it is nevertheless so fully documented that it forms a remarkably comprehensive source-book. It will certainly claim its place among the standard works written around the controversy of C.'s religious policy.

The difficulty, of course, lies in the hard necessity of interpreting a past spiritual tendency in terms of modern spiritual experience and environment; and this difficulty is increased when the ancient evidence is drawn in part from the fervent religious or philosophical writers of C.'s time, in part from a coinage of which the control-system is but dimly intelligible. A. is naturally much too good a scholar not to be aware of this, but the passion of his own convictions sometimes glows through the surface of an argument which is being presented as dispassionate. Thus, in the first chapter on the antecedents of C.'s conversion, it may be felt that the 'build-up' involves some special pleading. Granted the religious fervour from c. A.D. 250 and the growing political importance of monotheism, whether Christian or pagan—and this is admirably sketched—it still seems possible that A. has relied upon very slender grounds for his main position that C. was 'never an unbeliever' but that he had an old sympathy for Christianity, partly derived from his father (however reluctant a persecutor), partly strengthened by a Bishop Ossius so shadowy as to be hardly discernible. The second chapter, on the vision of C., is much more satisfactory. Here there is a fundamental clash of evidence—Eusebius, relating the vision and the subsequent dream, against Lactantius, knowing only of the dream immediately before the battle of the Mulvian Bridge. The necessity of resolving this conflicting evidence produces results of importance, for A. prefers Lactantius' version, with all that it implies of the dark superstition of an ill-educated man wielding immense power and subsequently wishing to test Christianity by its practical results. At what stage his convictions acquired

'sincerity and urgency' (p. 23) is more doubtful. Scarcely, one would think, before the battle, as A. implies: more probably after the *labarum* had proved its worth.

It is at this point that, in the third and fourth chapters, the old problem rears its formidable head. To what extent, after 312, was C.'s Christianity a purely personal belief—however imperfect, however superstitiously conceived—and to what extent a matter of State policy? On this A. gives no very clear answer. The initial political difficulties are painted in deceptively—if inevitably—general terms (pp. 26-9), and C.'s immediate mood of action wears a sharp outline not a little derived from our more certain knowledge of what was to come later. C. 'supports and exalts the Church', but 'as one who stands above it and outside it . . . and . . . still remains the head of the official religion of pagan polytheism' (p. 28), but it is surprising to find that in 313 C. can write to the Synod of Arles that he belongs to the Christian Church (p. 39). The evidence for his favours to the Christians during his first two months in Rome looks thin (p. 37). And while A. describes with skill the diverse ways in which statuary and coinage were tinged with Christian symbolism, and directs legitimate attention to the Trèves coinage of A.D. 312-13, which shows Licinius with Jupiter's attributes, Daza with Sol's, but C. in merely mortal guise, it is doubtful if he is right in holding that the stars on C.'s helmet in this issue are 'careless copies of the monogram of Christ' (pp. 40 f.). Die-sinkers invariably degraded a design by repetition, but on strictly evolutionary lines.

The picture which emerges so far is, *pace* A., one of an emperor whose absolutely necessary political opportunism involves religious as well as secular features. On the one hand he gives the Lateran Palace to the Bishop of Rome, and projects the Basilica: on the other, he remains the official head of paganism as *pontifex maximus*, and Sol does not disappear, like the other 'old gods', from the coinage, but continues for a

remarkably long time, as the 'glorious fame of the State' and of the young prince whose portrait accompanies the Sol coin-types. It may be felt, after reading A.'s pages, that in the middle period of his reign C. was little more pro-Christian than pro-pagan: Christ was one of many gods—when he was not the one god amid a setting of pagan demons. Recognition of the 'cross' issue-mark at the Ticinum mint in A.D. 313-14 as a magical insult hurled at paganism (p. 66) is to beg the question of the agency which controlled such small and intimate details: the injection of the *flos provinciarum* into the Senate was not more necessarily a Christian dilution of a pagan body than a rejuvenation, on age-old lines, of Rome's most venerable body; and laws against *haruspices* were surely (cf. pp. 76, 78) a defence against conspiracies.

After A.D. 324, as there can be no doubt, this picture undergoes important changes, and C.'s attitude towards Christianity becomes clearer and stronger. The pagan gods are absent from the coinage after the early twenties; emperor-worship is carefully 'sterilized';

and a mass of detailed evidence confirms the increase of favours to the Christians. C.'s Christian activity was focused at Constantinople—an *altera Roma* imitated detail by detail; and it is reasonable to suppose, as a partial corrective to the case presented by A.'s earlier chapters, that the vast spiritual reserves of paganism in the Old Rome (which, as A. claims, made necessary the Christian foundation of the New Rome and yet contrived to steal its thunder) were the principal and continuously operative check upon the Christian instincts of C. himself for a decade after the Mulvian Bridge. There is no need to regard C. as either calculating, hesitating, ambiguous, or double-dealing, if—taking care to narrow the essential gap between paganism and Christianity for all except the leaders of either faction—we regard him as pagan by instinct, tradition, and environment, and Christian by experiment, endeavour, deepening experience, and final conviction.

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND.

Christ Church, Oxford.

IN HONOUR OF THEODORE LESLIE SHEAR

Commemorative Studies in honor of Theodore Leslie Shear. (Hesperia: Supplement VIII.) Pp. xv+433; 64 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1949. Paper, \$15.

A VOLUME as important as it is imposing. A bibliography of Shear's own work is followed by articles printed in the alphabetical order of the contributors' names, an unwelcome arrangement in view of their number and the lack of an index. A classification by subjects will help; it involves citing some articles repeatedly.

Prehellenic: Caley on an Early Helladic needle of arsenical copper, a metal harder than ordinary copper; finds in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and central Europe hint that it may have been generally utilized before the invention of bronze. Waage on a well outside Corinth, 55 ft. deep, filled up in E.H. III with the aid of more

than twenty corpses. Wace on stone figurines from the mainland; he distinguishes forgeries which have been used to illustrate the technique of prehistoric carving! Blegen re-identifies the sites of Aulis and of Hyria, a town mentioned in the same clause of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, and reports the chance discovery at the latter of what appears to have been a tholos tomb, containing pottery and weapons of c. 1600 B.C. and an anta slab engraved with squadrons of ships—it might be to commemorate the Hyrian contingent which sailed from Aulis under Agamemnon.

Religion: Goldman discusses the relation of Heracles to Sandon, accepting his Mycenaean origin but admitting some oriental elements in the myths. Broneer proposes an explanation of Metageitnia. Bieber reviews Attic marriage rites in connexion with vases. Ferguson traces

the establishment of the Attic Bendi-deia to 429 and the panic caused by the plague. H. R. W. Smith writes on terra-cotta protomes of goddesses. Bonner interprets an amulet of the Ophite Gnostics.

Literary: Figurative uses of the Greek and Latin words for 'head' (van Hook). Broneer lavishes ingenuity on explaining the fanciful account of early Athens in the *Critias*. The composition of the *Birds* chorus (H. Lamar Crosby). Alexander's Unitarian ideas on the Oecumene (C. A. Robinson). Blood-sports of Roman times, with reference to a fresco in the Corinth arena (Capps). Attic poets of the Empire (Oliver).

Inscriptions: Copies by Vernon of 1675 (Meritt). Epitaph of Croesus, an Athenian killed in battle in the sixth century (p. 361). Ostraka from the agora (Vanderpool). Further thoughts on Orgeonika (Ferguson). Ephebes of Oeneis, c. 330 (Pritchett). Archons after Sulla (Dow). Menander and his son Pantaenus, Attic philosophers of c. A.D. 100, perhaps ancestors of the ex-philosopher Pantaenus who was head of the Christian school at Alexandria in the late second century (Parsons). A poetic family of Roman Athens (Oliver). Commodus and Athens (Raubitschek). The purpose of stamping large pots was to guarantee their conformity to standard measures of capacity, which varied in different times and places (Grace).

Coins: There are two long articles, by E. S. G. Robinson on the currency of the Athenian allies, and by Bellinger on the chronology of Attic new-style tetradrachms, dating their beginning as late as c. 180. Hoard evidence and its importance (Noe). A hoard of electrum of Rhescuporis, the third-century king of Bosphorus (M. Thompson).

Athenian topography and monuments: Broneer on the primitive town. The Altar of the Twelve Gods (Crosby). The west side of the Agora restored (Travlos, with illustrations of a model, pls. 55-6). The inner colonnades of the 'Theseum' (Hill). The roof-tiles of the Parthenon in the light of a new discovery (Orlandos).

Other architectural subjects: The use of

dark stone, especially developed by Mnesicles (Shoe). Two fragments at Corinth, from an architrave and a fluted shaft, are ascribed by Dinsmoor to a vanished temple of the fifth century, larger than any known in the Peloponnese; his detailed examination of the proportions of many buildings is of greater value than that conclusion. The arena at Corinth (Capps).

Arts and crafts: Two glass amulets, in the shape of a female head on either side, have been found in the Agora, one at the bottom of a well that became filled with rubbish during the Geometric period, so that it should not be later than 750, the other obviously later; R. Young enumerates analogies from Selinus, Naucratis, Alexandria (in a context not later than the early third century), Cyprus and Asia Minor, and attributes to the Phoenicians. In the case of the object from the well, which, however, photographs badly, the curls around the face seem to me unlikely to be Phoenician work of the eighth century; comparison of the original with Daedalic terra-cottas might be fruitful. The base of a late archaic stele from the Agora is carved with a man's feet and a dog (Homer Thompson). A late archaic bronze statuette of a youth was the handle of a lost patera (Jones). Carpenter shows that the figures of the twelve gods on an altar at Ostia are largely imitated from the Parthenon pediments, though some types of the fourth century are included. Morgan thinks the Apoxyomenus of Lysippus ought to be identified with the original of the Ephesus bronze, in which he sees more resemblance to the Agias than I can; he does not suggest an artist for the original of the Vatican statue. D. B. Thompson gives examples of clay moulds taken from the figures of repoussé metalware and used to make casts which could have served as the appliqué ornament on earthenware vases, such as Roman collectors are stated to have prized. Fragments of Panaitian vase-painting (Beazley). The subjects on Kertch vases relate to weddings (Bieber). Stamped amphoras (Grace). D. M. Robinson describes and illustrates his

collection of gems. Richter explains the varying ratio of Greek and oriental elements in 'Greco-Persian' gems as due to Greek compliance with the more or less Hellenized taste of orientals in the Achaemenid empire. A note by three metallurgists (p. 126) concerns a fragmentary sheet of zinc found after

rain on the north slope of the Acropolis in conjunction with pottery of the fourth to second centuries B.C.; it was not produced by modern methods but they question the possibility of its survival from antiquity.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

DEDICATIONS FROM THE ATHENIAN ACROPOLIS

Antony E. RAUBITSCHKE: *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*. A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C. Edited with the collaboration of Lilian H. Jeffery. Pp. xv+545; illus. Cambridge, Mass.: Archaeological Institute of America, 1949. Cloth.

It is not surprising that during the last forty or fifty years the study of later sixth-century Attic sculpture has largely centred on the *Korai* and other statuary brought to light in the exhaustive excavations of the Acropolis, which ended in 1890. Guy Dickins, in his *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum* (1912), was able to incorporate the results of the masterly work of reconstruction carried out by Heberdey on the *poros* pediments and, in part, that of Schrader on the marble sculptures; and since then the publication in recent years of Schrader's own comprehensive work, of Payne's brilliant essay with its superb illustrations, and of the works of Langlotz on the *Korai* and of Schuchardt on the other marble sculptures have vastly enriched and amplified our knowledge and understanding of the subject.

On the other hand, very little had been done to advance the study of the pedestals and bases, and of the inscriptions engraved on them, since Lolling's catalogue of the pre-Persian votive inscriptions was produced, five years after his death, by Paul Wolters, in 1899. This invaluable work, which unfortunately did not include photographs or other reproductions of the stones, was assumed, rather too readily, to approximate to finality; and in re-editing these texts in the *editio minor* of *I.G.* i (1924), Hiller found little to add, apart from the fruits of his studies of the epigrams.

That there were still extensive discoveries to make in this field was quickly realized by the young Austrian scholar who has written this book. His studies in Athens in 1936-8 yielded quite unexpectedly rich results, of which he promptly published preliminary accounts in the *Anzeiger* of the Vienna Academy (1936), *Jahreshefte*, xxxi (1938), in the *Bulletin* of the Bulgarian Archaeological Institute, xii (1938), and subsequently in the *Annual of the B.S.A.* xl (1943) and elsewhere. The earlier studies were mostly confined to reconstructing inscribed columnar and other pedestals and bases from fragments either published separately by, or not known to, Lolling, while that in *B.S.A.* revealed how much could still be done by way of fitting the plinths or feet of statues on to these pedestals. In his present work R. has not only incorporated all these, as well as some unpublished, reconstructions, but has given us a complete *Corpus* of all the dedicatory inscriptions from the Acropolis, on *poros* or marble, down to the end of the fifth century, numbering in all 393. This figure naturally includes a considerable number of small and unintelligible fragments, but, on the other hand, it includes several important inscribed columnar pedestals found during the work of repairing the north wall of the Acropolis, as well as the various dedications found by Broneer in excavating the Aphrodite Sanctuary at the foot of the north slope and a few fragments which had somehow strayed down into the Agora, to be brought to light by the American excavations. The contents of this rich volume may be summarized as follows: Nos. 1-58, Columnar Dedications, including inscribed capitals and one column-base

(No. 58); 59-177, Low Bases; 178-316, Pillar Monuments, grouped according to types, with the inscriptions cut either on the cavetto (or other pattern of) capital, or along the shaft, which is rectangular in section; 317-23, Supports for Tripods and Bronze Bowls; 324-33, Stelai and Altars; 334-84, Marble Basins (a most thorough study of the different rim-profiles, supports, etc.); 385-93, Unclassified Fragments (No. 388 is a diskos with the dedicator's name left unfinished). The remainder of the book (pp. 419-525) comprises (un-numbered) chapters on the Formulae of the Inscriptions (both in verse and in prose; pp. 419-31); Some Technical Aspects of the early Attic Dedications (e.g. Orthography, Retrograde Script, Letter-forms, Punctuation, etc.; pp. 432-53); The Early Acropolis Dedications as Historical Documents (including a study of the Dedicators and a particularly valuable discussion of the evidence from the inscriptions for the use of demotics by Athenian citizens before and after the Reforms of Cleisthenes; pp. 455-78); finally, in his Archaeological Summary, R. briefly analyses the evidence for the different types of votive statues and other dedications, in the light of the dimensions and shapes of the pedestals and bases and of the cuttings, dowel-holes, etc., on their upper surfaces; and in conclusion adds a detailed study of the works, dates, and style of the numerous artists whose signatures have survived—or have been conjecturally restored—on any of the dedications which he describes.

We are given, moreover, full indexes of names and places, and an exhaustive *Comparatio Numerorum*, which would have been rendered even more useful if R. had added to it a conspectus of all the new joins and attributions for which he is responsible. But this omission, and certain other points which will be mentioned later, do not materially affect the verdict that R. has planned and carried through his ambitious task with a very full measure of success, and has placed all students of these dedications under a deep obligation, whether their

approach is from the epigraphical, the artistic, or the historical angle.

The book is handsomely produced, and of a convenient size; and there is extremely little evidence from the author's command of English to show that it is not his native tongue. (Here one may notice two or three trifling slips: p. 203, the last two lines of the text have been transposed; p. 283, the illustration is of No. 248, not 249; p. 401, in the commentary on No. 372, where there is a reference to a letter being underlined in the transcription, no letter is in fact underlined.)

Nevertheless, at the risk of seeming ungrateful, there are some points which call for criticism, as their combined effect makes the book less valuable than it might otherwise have been. While there is admittedly a generous provision of illustrations, almost exactly equalling the number of dedications contained in the book, which consist of both photographs and drawings (admirably reproduced from squeezes) alike of inscriptions and of reconstructed pedestals and bases, some of the most important pieces of reconstruction are not illustrated at all. The result is that the reader must constantly have at hand copies of R.'s preliminary reports in order to verify from the illustrations published in them such important discoveries as the combination of the seated Scribe (Acr. Mus. 629) with an Ionic capital and the inscription *I.G. i². 548+663*; or the placing of the small Kore (Acr. Mus. 683) on the inscribed base *I.G. i². 620*, dedicated by Lysias and Evarchis, from which we find that this 'disarming little creature' (as Payne called her) was accompanied by an even smaller figure on her right; and even for the striking early-fifth-century Athena (No. 22 = Acr. Mus. No. 140), now placed on a column bearing the name of the dedicator, Angelitos, and of the sculptor, Evenor, we must refer, as for the other two items mentioned, to the illustrations in *B.S.A.* xl. If it was a matter of space, the author might, we feel, have omitted some of the less essential illustrations, e.g. No. 303, where only one letter has survived, or Nos.

275 and 277, among others, which show only a letter and a half; and it seems hardly necessary to give three photographs of No. 218, seeing that the first and third, which overlap, show the whole text, or two of No. 289. In fairness to the author it must be pointed out that he had to cut short his stay in Athens in 1938, and that such further illustrative material as he required was obtained for him in 1939 by Miss Lilian H. Jeffery, whose help and collaboration he generously acknowledges.

A further defect, which cannot be overlooked, is the lack of an *apparatus criticus* even for the metrical dedications. For instance, for the well-known Phayllos epigram (No. 76 = Tod, *G.H.I.* 21) a new (and, it must be added, unconvincing) restoration is offered, without even quoting the previous (and generally accepted one), namely:

[Τόνδε θεοῖ]σι Φάυ[λος | ἔθηκε ὁ νικ]δὼν τρις [ἐν]
[εὐρυχώροι] Πυθοῖ κα[ὶ | υ-υ-υ]ασασι σκ[-υ].

It may well be asked whether it is likely that a dedication *θεοῖσι* was erected on the Acropolis as early as c. 478 B.C.; whether *εὐρύχωρος* is an appropriate epithet for *Πυθώ*; and what can be made of *-ασασι σκ* (the photograph does not seem to be decisive for *καρφα* rather than *iota*). R. admits that 'the restoration is not certain, but shows that restorations different from those previously given are in fact possible'. This is by no means the only example of R.'s *horror vacui*; and others, which need not be quoted, raise grave doubts as to the advantage of restoring very fragmentary metrical texts on slender evidence; and indeed give the impression that R. is more at home in 'three-dimensional epigraphy', where his competence is unquestioned, than in the style and vocabulary of metrical dedications.

A few minor details may also be mentioned, as likely to puzzle or disappoint the careful reader. The height of the letters is hardly ever stated in the descriptions of the stones, which are otherwise most minutely accurate; the scale appended to most of the photographs gives, of course, an approximate

indication, but a scale seldom accompanies the drawings. Again, the commendable reaction against inserting needless dots under incomplete or doubtful letters seems at times to be carried too far, since in some instances letters are shown as undotted (i.e. certain) when the photograph shows no trace of them at all. And, to revert to the subject of illustrations, the reader who wishes to verify the statement that 'the whole (of No. 94) is engraved by the same hand as the Salaminian decree and No. 93' will have to consult three different publications, as R. illustrates none of the three. It will be observed also that there is no comment on the inconsistency between the reading of the (not very clear) photograph of the early graffito-like fragment, No. 310 and the drawing by Wolters reproduced for this stone in *I.G.* i². 484.

One suggestion may be offered here for a fragment which R. has failed to elucidate. On the lip of a marble basin (No. 378 = *I.G.* i². 731) are the remains in large letters of *ἀν]έθεκ[εν*, and above them, in smaller letters, inverted, *ῶλ]υμπιεο[*. This cannot be restored as a dedication to Zeus Olympios, on the Acropolis, though R. is inclined to think it possible in spite of the form of the word; and his alternative suggestion that 'it may, however, be a metrical verse with *συμπίνω* in it' (on a basin at that!) stands self-condemned. Is it not obviously a thank-offering for a victory *ἐξ* *ῶλ]υμπιέο[ν]*? And if so, it is by far the earliest epigraphical mention of this festival, for which no evidence of any sort seems to be known earlier than *I.G.* ii². 1496, l. 82 (the list of contributions *ἐκ τοῦ δερματικοῦ* for 334/3 B.C.; cf. l. 114 (rest.) for the following year).

It must be left to others, better qualified than the present reviewer, to discuss R.'s final chapters, and in particular to assess the value of his reconstructions of the lives and styles of some of the less-known artists put forward in his final chapter. Here, as throughout the whole book, his profound knowledge of the material and his unquestioned mastery of the sources deserve the highest praise, but some of his conclusions

seem to rest on rather frail foundations. To discuss these topics with the fullness which they deserve lies outside the

scope of the present notice of this most stimulating book.

A. M. WOODWARD.

CORINTH

Corinth. Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. XV, Part I: The Potters' Quarter. By Agnes Newhall STILLWELL. Pp. xiii + 138; 52 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1948. Cloth, \$10.

THE position of Mrs. Stillwell's excavation, carried out from 1928 to 1931, is by the north-west corner of the city wall of Corinth and about a mile west of the Agora¹ (Ke on the small plan *J.H.S.* 1948, 61). In spite of the remoteness of the site the finds of moulds and wasters justify its being called 'Potters' Quarter', though it was not necessarily the only such quarter, to judge by the kilns discovered elsewhere in Corinth.

In general the site seems to have been occupied from the eighth to the fourth century B.C. The principal finds were remains of buildings and of the city wall, pottery, terracotta figurines and moulds for figurines, and coins. All this material was too much for a single volume, but the division chosen appears arbitrary—we have here the graves and the metal objects, but not the pottery they contained; the buildings, but not the sherds² that date them, though the coins are described; the moulds for figurines, but only three or four of the figurines themselves. So it is not yet possible to check all of Mrs. Stillwell's conclusions or review her work justly.

Chapters I and II deal with the structural remains and the objects of stone. The buildings are mostly too poorly built and preserved for useful conclusions, and even the 'Terracotta Factory' (so called from the numerous

moulds found in it) cannot be clearly reconstructed. Mrs. Stillwell diffidently traces three building periods in the factory and roughly dates them by the style of their walls. Most interesting are the little shrines containing rectangular stelai with a narrow shelf at the top: Mrs. Stillwell suggests that these stelai served as foreshortened tables for offerings, two proper specimens of which were also detected. Apart from tanks and water-channels there was in the structures themselves nothing particularly appropriate to potteries, and notably no kiln was found. A section of the classical city wall, dated about the end of the fifth century, was uncovered. On the west side were three round towers and a gate, and at the north-west corner a round and a trapezoidal tower adjoined each other but their relationship could not be ascertained. A grave under the wall exercises Mrs. Stillwell's erudition. In front of this wall there were also traces of another fortification wall, ascribed from the sherds in its fill in one part to the first, in another to the second half of the seventh century. If the interpretation is correct, this is a discovery of great importance for the early history of Corinth. It is a pity that the general plan is absurdly small in scale, niggardly in detail, and blurred in printing: a detailed plan is provided only for the 'Terracotta Factory'.

The moulds for figurines are described and discussed in Chapter III. They are an unusually large and exceptionally interesting assortment, and Mrs. Stillwell has made an impressive collection of likely products of her moulds. Among the notable items are No. 1, an early head completely Oriental in effect and perhaps impressed from an Oriental import, and No. 26, an old man's face that is remarkably realistic for the classical period to which it seems to belong. No. 13 shows to what varied uses the

¹ To form a clear idea of the extent and arrangement of ancient Corinth is difficult, since there is no good plan available. It would be most helpful if the editors of the *Corinth* series could publish—even separately or irrelevantly—the large-scale contoured survey of the city area.

² Nor is it clear what Mrs. Stillwell means by her general term 'Geometric Protocorinthian'.

products of one mould could be put. No. 10 looks as if it might be a male head, bearded. The miscellaneous pieces of metal and glass are collected in Chapter IV with numerous references to other publications.

The plates, which include many views of the site as well as illustrating almost every object that is described, are very fair. The proof-reading is excellent; the only errors I noted were in compass

directions in para. 2, p. 17. The index, excellent for the first three chapters, neglects the fourth.

Mrs. Stillwell has performed what must have been an exasperating task with patience and caution, sometimes carried to excess. The result is a book with much to interest various kinds of specialist.

R. M. COOK.

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge.*

THE FOLK-LORE OF CHIOS

P. P. ARGENTI and H. J. ROSE: *The Folk-Lore of Chios*. 2 vols. Pp. xiv + 1199; 141 drawings in text. Cambridge: University Press, 1949. Cloth, £7. 7s. net.

THE value of a complete record of the folk-lore of a Greek island is obviously immense. The old social order is changing only too rapidly and this record has been made just in time. For the backbone of the book—though, of course, he is not the sole source—we are mainly indebted to the researches of Mr. Stylianos Vios. He was, I imagine, one of those Greek antiquaries of a generation ago who, in spite of every kind of difficulty and an almost complete lack of the apparatus of scholarship, were inspired with a genuine zeal for learning and a passionate love of their birthplace. A few such I met when I was young. They had their delectable foibles, but they were a kind of man for which I have a great admiration. I should have welcomed some information about Mr. Vios beyond the ascriptions in the footnotes.

The merit of the book is that the record is complete and we must be most grateful to Dr. Argenti and Professor Rose for making it accessible to English readers. Besides covering superstitions, social practices, folk-medicine, folk-tales, drolls, folk-songs, proverbs, etc., it has wisely included all aspects of the life of the folk, implements, occupations, flora and fauna, which furnish indeed not the least valuable pages of the book. I note with interest that the threshing sledge on Chios is set with knives (p. 60). All the specimens which I have seen in the Cyclades, Crete, or Cappadocia

were set with flints. I am ignorantly puzzled by the surprise of Dr. Malcolm Smith at the presence of seals—'a very rare animal and possibly now extinct' (p. 114). Apart from the references in classical literature, I had only too frequent evidence that the seal was not uncommon farther south in the Aegean when I was trying to catch fish for the mess in the First World War.

Professor Rose's knowledge of the Lower Culture and of European Folk-lore is well known. I have no serious comment to make upon the chapters dealing with superstitions, practices at birth, marriage, and death, and so on. The classical references, it is true, seem sometimes a little fanciful (e.g. those on pp. 10, 67, 209, 223, 597, 862), though the startling note on p. 48, which appears to cite Homer as evidence about the Jews in Chios, is due to a transposition of the notes by a printer's error. I cannot think it probable (though, of course, it is not impossible) that the characteristics of fairy gold derive from the chance discovery of cinerary urns (p. 232), nor can I believe, though the origin of the *Dodekadha* or *Council of Twelve* has always puzzled me, that it has much to do with the medieval structure of local Chian society (p. 437); for it is a common feature of all Greek folk-tales. On p. 224, if the legend of *ἡ Κουνουκλοῦ* has been published, it would have been kind to give the reference. *The Bridge of Arta* story is, of course, familiar, but there are two types of it, the distribution of which is not without interest.

Folk-tales are inevitably dying everywhere. By and large the versions here

recorded are not very good. The art of story telling had already declined and many were collected from the lips of very old people. The annotation is infelicitous. Stith-Thompson, though he may be the latest (p. 43), is not in my opinion the surest guide to the study of folk-tales, and a knowledge of the content of the published folk-tales of the area is quite indispensable to useful annotation. And on Greek folk-tales a very great deal of work has been done; my own knowledge is now quite out of date, for the corpus of published material must have been trebled if not quadrupled in bulk since I wrote the notes on Dawkins's texts from Cappadocia.

The notes in this book, however, seem so often at a loss when the information should not have been very difficult to discover. For example, our authors appear not to know of variants of the knife, rope, and stone of patience (p. 499). There are at least two Greek variants, both of which have been translated into English; from Athens Kambouroglou, *Δελτίον* i, p. 345, translated by Garnett and Stuart-Glennie, *Greek Folk Poesy*, ii, p. 40 (knife, cord, whetstone), and from Epirus von Hahn No. 12, translated by Geldart, *Folklore of Modern Greece*, p. 62, text in Pio, *Νεοελληνικά Παραμύθια* p. 49 (knife, candle, whetstone). A Turkish version (knife, stone) will be found in Kunoz, *Türkische Volksmärchen aus Stambul*, p. 215, translated by Bain, *Turkish Fairy Tales*, p. 188. For the general distribution see Bolte and Polivka, i, p. 192, ii, p. 276. It occurs in Basile's *Pentamerone*, ii. 8 (doll, knife, whetstone). Similarly those who wish may find variants of the introduction of

Story XIX by looking up the references given in Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, p. 271 for Greek and Balkan variants, and in general Bolte and Polivka, ii, pp. 380-94. One is to be found in Straparola, Night iv, story 3. These are random examples which, alas! could only too easily be multiplied.

The notes to the folk-songs give no guide as to what is Chian and what belongs to the common stock of Greek popular poetry. There are not even references to Passow. From laziness I select the carols for comment; for upon them I once wrote a paper.¹ The first, on p. 643, is common form and found everywhere in Greece. The second, *The Golden Tree*, p. 713, so far as I knew in 1914, had been recorded in Aigina and the southern Sporades. The *Double or Lover's Carol*, p. 643, had then been recorded in the Cyclades, southern Sporades, and Smyrna, but not in mainland Greece. The apparently nonsense character (p. 643, note 1) of some of the second half-lines in the *Double Carol* is simply the result of corruption of the text by oral transmission. The doublet, if I may so call it, is a love song, see *Folklore Studies, Ancient and Modern*, p. 83.

But the merits of the book do not stand or fall by its notes. It is an invaluable and very complete record of a definite area, made just before it was too late, and it will remain an indispensable book of reference for students of Greek folk-lore.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

King's College, London.

¹ *B.S.A.* xx, 1914, pp. 32-58, reprinted without the Greek texts in *Folklore Studies, Ancient and Modern*, p. 73. The texts were collected and the verse translations made by W. R. Paton.

GREEK COINS

Charles SELTMAN: *Masterpieces of Greek Coinage*. Pp. 128; 55 coins illustrated in actual size and enlargement from photographs of the originals or electro-types. London: Faber, 1949. Cloth, 21s. net.

REPRODUCTIONS of Greek coin-types on an enlarged scale have appeared in

several recent publications, but only in a limited field, which has usually been Sicily. This collection has a much wider range, and gives a good selection of Greek coinages before the Hellenistic period, though some gaps are noticeable—for instance, in the fifth-century issues of Ionia. However, it provides a

welcome opportunity for studying the different methods of suiting the design to its purpose as an integral part of the coin which are to be found in the Greek homeland and the West—differences which can be traced to motives of a psychological character, as well as to economic reasons: and the nature of these differences is brought out more clearly by the enlargement of the designs.

The primary object of a coin-type is, of course, to secure credit for the coin as money. When the Ionian merchants learnt the practice of making up metal for use in barter in a form convenient for handling—which probably came to them from Mesopotamia, the nursery of many trading ideas—their object in stamping the ingots was to show who had prepared them, and so to transfer the credit of the maker to his coin. It was a more personal form of the stamp which appears on some gold ingots, probably the earliest to be coined in Egypt, where the hieroglyphic legends are simply 'good gold': as gold was a royal metal in Egypt, the name of the authority for the stamp was not necessary. In Ionia the signet of the maker of the coin provided the guarantee, which would hold good wherever the signet was known. As this practice proved both useful and profitable to the merchants who issued coins, in due course it was adopted by cities or their rulers, whose badges took the place of the signets; and in that form it found its way across the Aegean Sea.

The earliest coin-types of Greece are all of a simple character; and the enlargements given here are instructive in showing how the simplicity can be traced not only in the choice of designs but also in their treatment. The type, as Mr. Seltman points out, is carefully adjusted to the field of the die, and is handled with the greatest possible economy of line; so that, however much it is magnified, it does not lose its coherence. At the same time it is thoroughly practical: it stands up well to the wear of handling, which is inevitable in the life of a coin if it fulfils its proper purpose as an instrument of

trade. The result is that, however rubbed a sixth- or fifth-century Greek coin may be, it is always possible to read the types and to know by what authority the coin was issued. The Athenian tetradrachms are outstanding examples of how the types of a coin could be made to perform their proper function—in brief, of how to keep the types in their place. It has been wondered why Aristophanes called the archaic and stiff types of the fifth-century Athenian coins *κάλιστα*: he was not thinking of charm in an artistic sense, but, as he explains in the next line, of the merits of the coins as correctly struck and of good sound metal: the virtue of the types was not in their attractiveness, but in their perfect adaptation to the part they had to play: their charm was moral, not physical.

When the Greek settlers in Sicily started coinages of their own, they were faced with a different set of problems in securing the acceptance of the coins—in obtaining credit. The economic story is long and complicated, but briefly the situation was that they had to deal with a native population whose standard of value was bronze, and that so far as the use of silver was concerned they had, after the middle of the sixth century, to meet competition from Carthage. That meant advertisement: the mere use of city badges was not sufficient, as it had been in Greece, to secure credit for their silver: there had to be types chosen to emphasize the achievements or the products of the cities. This led to what may be called a medallic treatment of the types, which became more and more elaborate, abandoning the simplicity and directness that characterized the coinages of the homeland. The Sicilian coins of the fifth century are works of art, and almost the only thing about many of them that suggests that they could be circulated as money is that they are made to suit the regular denominations of currency. This meant a very restricted field, and the types were admirably designed accordingly: it is very noticeable that when, as here, the coins are shown in actual size and in

enlargement side by side, few of the designs come out well in the enlargement: they were made for execution on a small scale, and when magnified they lose the purity of line of the originals, and appear coarse, sometimes with the whole balance upset. But artistic merit does not seem to have increased the credit of Sicilian coins in trade: they are not often found in Greece, though Greek coins of the homeland are plentiful in Sicilian hoards. If Mr. Seltman's interesting suggestion, that the two men Execestides and Phrygillus whom Aristophanes pillories in the *Birds* are the artists of those names who signed coin-dies in Sicily and Magna Graecia about the same time, is correct, it is not surprising that Aristophanes, comparing

their productions with the Athenian owls, did not think that men who had such ideas of what a coin implied were desirable as citizens in a model state. Plato would probably have adjudged the Sicilian coins to be masterpieces of art but not masterpieces of coinage; and Mr. Seltman seems to tend in the same direction when he says that celators made coins not only for prolonged circulation in markets but also for storage in caches, vaults, and sanctuaries. A coin cannot serve two masters: if it is designed to appeal to the collector, it is likely to lose its currency value like the talent that was buried.

J. G. MILNE.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

VERSE TRANSLATION

Sir Herbert J. C. GRIERSON: *Verse Translation with special reference to translation from Latin*. (English Association: Presidential Address, 1948.) Pp. 26. London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Paper, 2s. net.

UNLESS 'translation' be taken in its widest sense, i.e. to mean any work that depends on reference, however intermittent, to a foreign original, the title of this Address will be found misleading. Pope, for example, is described on p. 14 as 'translating' Horace 'closely', though the lines in question, as their title shows, do not profess to be more than an 'imitation'. Nor will readers who look to Sir Herbert Grierson for hints on verse translation in the usual sense of the term find much to help them until they reach the last three pages.

His main theme is historical. After admitting that the 'translation' of verse is, in one sense, impossible, he shows that the *corpus* of English poetry nevertheless includes much that 'is fundamentally translated verse' or much (as he puts it on p. 21) that is 'not mere translation but what springs from translation or the thought of it, a variation on the theme of the original poem'. Most of his survey (pp. 3-20) deals with variations on the themes of

Latin (and some French and Italian) poets, beginning with the period of Chaucer and ending with the Romantic Revival and earlier nineteenth century. Ovid, until the time of Dryden's *Preface to the Fables* (1699), was the dominating figure, 'translated', i.e. adopted and adapted in different ways, by Chaucer, Shakespeare, Donne, Milton,—now as story-teller or 'master of sentiment and manners', now as a model of style as well, now as a sensuous poet of love. In the Classical Age the first favourite was Horace, despite Pope's *Homer*. Sir Herbert does not think 'that the genius of our language admits of the condensation which is characteristic of the *Odes*'. He regards the *Epistles* and *Satires* as more important influences and decides that 'the finest product of the spirit and art of Horace in our own poetry is neither Prior nor Pope, but that Christian Horace... William Cowper'. He decides also that the poet nearest in spirit to Virgil (restored to pre-eminence with the Romantic Revival) is not Milton, whose genius is more akin to that of Homer, nor Tennyson, for all his careful art, but Wordsworth, more especially the Wordsworth of *Laodamia*.

A short section follows on the use made by English poets of originals in

Greek. If this has been comparatively rare, 'one reason is that it is more easy to play variations on the work of a lesser than of a great poet, on Ovid more easily than on Virgil, on Virgil than on Homer'. Finally the tentative conclusion is reached that a 'poet of original and genuine inspiration will seldom be content with what is just translation'. An outlet in the practice of such translation is sought rather by the poet who is neither a poet-prophet (as was Milton, or Shelley) nor 'a poet-artist for whom the form itself is an inspiration' (as was Bridges). Andrew Lang was one example; another, Sir Herbert Grierson confesses, was the young Herbert Grierson. He gives a charming example of his own work, translated from the Dutch of P. C. Boutens; and another, also from Dutch, may be found on pp. 67-71 of *Translation*, 2nd Series (Phoenix Press, 1947). Experience has taught him two things. One is that 'it needs happy moments' for this task of translation; the other, that 'Art and Chance', as Aristotle says, 'are closely

akin'. He knows, of course, that poetry cannot be taught; but like Horace in lines 366 ff. of the *Ars Poetica* he slips in some sage advice: Beware of large-scale translation; be content with this or that poem which has taken possession of you for the time. Further, 'a somewhat elaborate poem is more easy to translate, with at least the appearance of success, than one whose charm is its simplicity'. Let those who doubt this last statement try their hands on the simpler poems of Simonides; and let those who would dispute any other of Sir Herbert's conclusions go to them in their context and amplify this bare record. They will find, incidentally, some inaccuracies in the Latin texts quoted on pp. 7-11; but these are small matters. It is more important that Sir Herbert has shown once again, as in his *Rhetoric and English Composition*, the great advantage of a classical training to students of our own literature.

T. F. HIGHAM.

Trinity College, Oxford.

SHORT REVIEWS

Jan C. F. NUCHELMANS: *Die Nomina des sophokleischen Wortschatzes*. Vorarbeiten zu einer sprachgeschichtlichen und stylistischen Analyse. Pp. 128. Utrecht: Beyer, 1949. Paper.

As is explained in the title and in the Introduction, this doctoral dissertation is intended to provide material for future investigators of the language of Sophocles. The author advances no theories of his own, but he has carried out his appointed task with care and with unlimited industry. His list of authorities covers four pages, and he includes in his survey not only the *Ichneutae* but all the Fragments, even the most recent. His work consists in the main of lists of nouns and adjectives of the same morphological type, and appended to each list are references to relevant authorities, and brief notes on the history of the form in question. These lists are followed by nine pages of Sophoclean *nomina* of types too various to be fitted into the preceding lists.

The work may be useful to students of the science of language, to which class the author, to judge by his notes, belongs. They deal with words in isolation, but the student of style cannot do that. It may be satisfactory for him to have a complete list of Sophoclean *nomina* brought up to date, but without their context they tell him little. With most words he can discover the context with

the aid of a Sophoclean lexicon, but with newly discovered words that aid fails him. Dr. Nuchelmanns naturally cannot give us the new fragments in full, but it would have been more useful, when a word in the list came from a fragment not included in Pearson, on whom he relies, to indicate where we could find it. And as the *Ichneutae* has been published, but not included in Sophoclean lexica, reference to that was more easily indicated. This would have added to the author's labours, but he evidently does not fear labour.

F. R. EARP.

Eugenio DELLA VALLE: *Menandro, I Contendenti*. Pp. 154. Bari: Laterza, 1949. Paper.

THIS is a reconstruction of the *Epitrepontes* of Menander in Italian with a brief introduction and considerable notes at the end to explain the line adopted. The translation reads pleasantly and easily, and it would be interesting to see it performed. Reconstruction is a tricky business where so much depends on guess-work; the present author has been extremely conservative and his chief object has clearly been to provide a framework in which the true Menander may be convincingly presented to a modern audience; this he has probably achieved. A few points call for comment. The exposition is largely given by a soliloquy of

Onesimos after the cook has entered, which is a good invention. But there is no divine monologue; the compelling reason for assuming a divine monologue (quite apart from the supreme charm of Murray's Callisto) is that otherwise the audience have no method of appreciating the irony of Smikrines' arbitration over his own unknown grandson. Chairestratos and Simias are friends; I have argued elsewhere that Simias is Chairestratos' slave, and I am more than ever convinced that these two colourless young men are impossible; Chairestratos by himself (or with a slave) is a foil for Charisios as Moschion for Polemon in the *Perikeiromene*; in this first overhearing scene I think Chairestratos was joined by Habrotonon and not by Simias; della Valle plays down Chairestratos' love for Habrotonon. The big gap at the end of the third act is so difficult that there are many possibilities and little certain to suggest: I only note that *μηδέου* in the sense of 'to no one' (488) seems to me unlikely. It also seems to me unnecessarily difficult to send Chairestratos and Simias into town at the end of Act III and to bring them back silently at the end of Act IV. Like Murray, della Valle follows Robertson in using the Didot speech for Pamphile's defence, but he misses Murray's nice point in making Smikrines reserve the baby to play as a trump card; a very good suggestion, however, is that Onesimos appears for a moment early in their dialogue and tells Charisios to come and listen; but I think that Charisios listens not through a closed door but through a half-open door like the girl on the Tarentine fragment (Pickard-Cambridge, *Attic Theatre*, figs. 55-6). The beginning of Act V is again difficult; della Valle makes Charisios announce that he has freed Onesimos and give Habrotonon into the patronage of Chairestratos; thus he can end the play 8 lines after the end of the text. I prefer to think that Chairestratos (like Smikrines) is ignorant of the reconciliation and is enlightened by Onesimos and that Sophrone has rather more to say to convince Smikrines, who is possibly finally reconciled to Charisios. But much remains uncertain, and I would reiterate that della Valle has done his work charmingly and his restorations are well argued.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University College, London.

Mario UNTERSTEINER: *Sofisti*. Testimonianze e Frammenti. Fasc. I. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, Sezione Filologia Greca, vol. iv.) Pp. xxii+124. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia', 1949. Paper, L. 1000.

THIS is the first of four fascicles of a volume on the Sophists which is to be based on Diels-Kranz. Here we have chapters 79-81 (ältere Sophistik, Protagoras, und Xenias): Gorgias, Lycophron, and Prodicus will be treated next. U. gives the text of Diels-Kranz without the *apparatus criticus*, except where he regards a variant as historically or philosophically important. He adds to the text certain passages (marked by an asterisk) which he believes to provide necessary additional evidence. These additions are largely from Plato's *Protagoras* and *Sophistes*, but they include Simplicius,

in *Physica* 1108. 18 ff., placed after Diels-Kranz 80 B 7; and Sextus Empiricus, *adv. Math.* vii. 55-9 after 80 B 8. U. gives an Italian translation opposite the Greek and writes footnotes. There is an introductory note on the word *σοφιστής* and a bibliography.

The work is intended to help students (they cannot, we learn, obtain Diels-Kranz) and this may excuse the inclusion of so many general works in the bibliography. U. also wishes to give evidences for his own book *I Sofisti* published last year in Turin. Without this work it is hard to judge conclusions reached in it which appear in the present work as footnotes; but there is interesting reference to the reasons for adding the Sextus passage to Diels-Kranz 80 B 8. U. agrees with Diels that the *περί πάλης* mentioned by Plato (*Sophistes* 232, D, E) and similar treatises were subsections of a larger work. This was the *Ἀντιλογία* according to U., and the arguments attributed by Sextus to Anacharsis (who comes between Xenias and Protagoras in his succession of deniers of the *κρητήριον*) are really the refutation of 'technical' infallibility in Protagoras' *Ἀντιλογία*. No doubt these arguments are wrongly ascribed to Anacharsis and belong to the same climate of discussion as Socratic 'arguments from the arts', but it is odd that Sextus or his source separates them from Protagoras' known views, and the attribution seems hardly justified. Could Protagoras not have written *περί πάλης*?

The introductory note leans heavily on quotations and contains the unfortunate suggestion that Herodotus' description (iv. 95) of Pythagoras as a *σοφιστής* supports the view (itself unfortunate) that there were close links between the Sophists and the Pythagoreans.

J. B. SKEMP.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Armand DELATTE: *La Constitution des États-unis et les Pythagoriciens*. Pp. 30. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1948. Paper, 75 fr.

THE American Constitution is marked by the separation of the three powers (legislative, executive, and judicial) and the system of control and 'balance' established between them. The constitution-makers of 1787 found this principle of political equilibrium in Montesquieu (they could have found it in F. Bacon), who got it from Polybius on the Roman and Spartan constitutions. Polybius, like Cicero (in *Rep.*), must have received it from Panaetius, who in this respect exhibits the influence of Pythagoreanism, as did also Plato (*Laws* 691 D) and Aristotle. D. argues further that since Polybius regards political balance as 'justice'—a purely philosophical view of justice in antiquity—this constitutional doctrine comes from Pythagorean mathematicians like Archytas, and indeed from Pythagoras himself. Here he perhaps seeks to prove too much; certainly some of the texts which he quotes are insecure if not inconsequent. Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 130, for example, refers to a mixture which is not justice but a tempering of justice with injustice, which is surely a very different matter.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

Aristotle: *On Coming-to-be and Passing-away*. Some Comments. By W. J. VERDENIUS and J. H. WASZINK. (*Philosophia Antiqua*, volume i.) Pp. 89. Leiden: Brill, 1946. Paper.

THIS short booklet, which is presented as a supplement to the commentary of Joachim, is full of interesting and pertinent matter. A considerable number of difficult and doubtful passages in the *De Gen. et Corr.* is dealt with; where necessary the textual reading is discussed, and a reinterpretation offered. The authors are well read in their subject; many of their discussions are well illustrated from other passages in Aristotle and elsewhere; and in every case they have something of value to put forward. One of the longer articles, which is particularly valuable, deals with an idiomatic usage of *καί* in Aristotle which had been misunderstood by many scholars. This is a book which no future editor or translator of the *De Gen. et Corr.* will wish to overlook.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

Reinhold STRÖMBERG: (1) *On Some Greek Proverbial Phrases*. Pp. 25. Göteborg: Gumperts, 1947. Paper, kr. 3-75. (2) *Grekiska Ordspråk, en antologi översatt och försedd med korta förklaringar*. Pp. 62. Göteborg: Wettergren, 1949. Paper, kr. 7.

(1) THIS slight essay begins with, and sometimes returns to, the rather unpromising plan of classifying proverbs according to the 'place of action' to which they refer. The place selected is a well; but this term soon has to include a ditch, a pit, and a river. S. appears not to see that the 'well' in Plato, *Theat.* 174 c refers not only to some proverb but to the story about Thales; and that the dance of the (thirsty) wolf round the (inaccessible) well has no relevance to either. Later S. changes without notice his principle of classification, and groups proverbs together because they (allegedly) apply to similar circumstances, though the 'locations' involved, such as frying-pans and lions' whiskers, seem far removed from wells. These collections seem to the author, but not to the obtuse reviewer, to shed some light on *κόραξ ὑδρεύει* (of the delaying messenger), and on the pit which awaits the *αἰολὸς ἄνθρωπος* (who presumably dug it). Apart from his faulty method S. shows an excessive tendency to explain all proverbs as based upon popular tales.

(2) This is a pleasantly printed selection of some 250 Greek proverbs with translations and brief annotations in Swedish. There are some illustrations, chiefly from vase-paintings.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

Xenophon, *the Persian Expedition*. A new translation by Rex WARNER. Pp. 309; map. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1949. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.

XENOPHON'S *Anabasis* certainly deserved the early place which it occupies among the Penguin Classics which are appearing under Dr. Rieu's editorship,

and Mr. Rex Warner has presented it to us in an attractive version which has the merit of not seeming to be a translation while reproducing the simple, straightforward style of the original.

Most of those who have learned Greek have made an early acquaintance with the *Anabasis*, or rather with a part of it or selections from it, and probably their youthful struggles with a new and difficult language do not allow them to appreciate the charm of the work as a whole. If in later years they read the book straight through either in the original or in Mr. Warner's translation, they will realize that it is one of the world's great books. It has the advantage of describing an historical incident which is complete in itself and deals with one of the most difficult and interesting of military problems, namely, how to conduct an expeditionary force, which has played a distinguished part in an unsuccessful campaign and has lost its leader, homewards mainly through hostile country, and the story is told by the general to whose inspired leadership its salvation was due.

Xenophon also, as Mr. Warner points out in his admirable introduction, gives us an excellent picture of the everyday life of the ordinary soldier, such as we seldom get in military histories and nowhere else in Greek literature. He also sketches with great skill the personalities with whom he is brought into contact.

It was a good idea on the part of the translator to insert headings to the books and chapters, and to add at the end an index of proper names with brief descriptions.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

Α. Χ. Χατζής: *Περὶ τοῦ νόμου τῆς συνθέσεως τῶν ῥημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ Ἑλληνικῇ γλώσσῃ*. (Βιβλιοθήκη Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐταιρείας Ἐπιστημῶν, 1.) Pp. 47. Athens: Constantinides & Michalas, 1947. Paper.

THERE is a rule attributed to J. J. Scaliger condemning Greek compound verbs formed like *εὐαγγέλλω*, *δυσθνήσκω*, and *δυσπροσιεσθαι*. The present work sets out to qualify that rule by supplying further and better particulars of Greek practice in this matter, a matter on which the author and six other Greek savants have published some ten papers since 1926. At first the author seems to take a rather too respectful view of linguistic law, e.g., in assuming, at p. 11, that at some, admittedly unrecorded, stage of its early history Greek obeyed Scaliger's *aurum praeceptum πλήρως*. More probably, if we must conjecture, language was human from the start, in making laws but not obeying them. The substance of the work, however, erases that first impression. After showing that ancient Greek grammarians recognized the essential difference between *syntheta* and *parasyntheta*, and having discussed in general the inroads of analogy in this sphere, the author, in the most valuable part of his work, pp. 17-39, illustrates these by cataloguing, with brief observations, 168 compound verbs and 37 proper names of widely differing dates and types of formation. His conclusion is sound enough, that each questionable compound must be considered in the light of all

the relevant facts and not be judged by *προκατάληψις*. This, if nothing else, is a salutary warning. Perhaps Housman was too absolute in his strictures on *δυοσχεύματα*. The author appends a bibliography of his 129 publications since 1902.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

Ladislav STRZELECKI: *Studia prosodiaca et metrica*. (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego, lxxiii. 3). Pp. 40. Cracow: Polish Academy, 1948. Paper.

THIS brochure, published under the auspices of the Philological Faculty of the Polish Academy, is written in Latin and contains two articles. The first is on the quantity of final *o* in Virgil. S. is dissatisfied with Hartenberger's dissertation on the subject (*De o finali apud poetas Latinos ab Ennio usque ad Iuvenalem*, Bonn, 1911) since H. makes no distinction (1) between *-o* occurring in arsis and in thesis, (2) between nominal and verbal or adverbial forms. Put shortly S.'s contention is this: only the final *-o* of second declension datives and ablatives can, in Virgil, occur in the thesis of a foot. The final *-o* of the nominative of substantives, of verbs, and of adverbs (e.g. *virgo, canto, immo*), being of uncertain quantity (*paene anceps*), can only stand in arsis, where (presumably) the stress determines it as long. It is hard to believe that he proves his case. For metrical reasons (as S. sees) the thing resolves itself into an examination of Virgilian usage in the first and fourth feet. To save time let us call datives and ablatives of second declension substantives and adjectives A, and the rest B.¹ The facts (doubtless correctly given) are: there are only two cases in Virgil of B in the fourth foot (e.g. *Aen. vi. 45 cum virgo: 'poscere fata . . .')*: in the first foot there are twelve (e.g. *Aen. v. 645 Pyrgo, tot Priami . . .*). Of these twelve, three are feminine proper nouns. (Two of these bear an elided *-que*, which, oddly enough, S. supposes to lengthen the *-o*.) Three are verbs (two first person present indicatives, and *esto*—'which, as coming from an original *estod*, has an assuredly long *o*'). One is *ambo* and five are *ergo*. But if any word had a doubtful final *o* that word is *ergo*. Virgil elides it nearly forty times and, though he does not ever scan it *ergō*, Tibullus and Ovid both did. If, therefore, Virgil felt that a doubtful final *-o* should not stand in thesis, surely *ergo* is one of the first words he would have avoided in the first foot.

The second part is a careful study of elision in Juvenecus. S. shows that this late poet is much more sparing of elision in general than Virgil and only allows it in certain feet. A comparison of Juvenecus' use with that of Ovid in the *Metamor-*

phoses would perhaps have been more interesting; and even as it is S. tends to spoil his own case by special pleading: e.g. having stated that J. does not allow elision of a word of anapaestic form in the third arsis he accounts for the line *haec fatiis populo ex omni delecta seorsum* by regarding the *-o* as anceps, and dismisses a *blando* which contravenes one of his rules with the remark 'vocabulum *blando* non pro spondeo sed pro trochaeo est habendum'.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

T. J. HAARHOFF: *Vergil the Universal*. Pp. ix + 126. Oxford: Blackwell, 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

IN 1931 Professor Haarhoff published his *Vergil in the Experience of South Africa*, which was sympathetically reviewed by R. S. Conway in *C.R.* xlv. 227. This book he has now reissued, with some minor alterations, a new introductory chapter, and a new title.

It is a risky business to rewrite an old book, particularly one that is in the nature of a tract for the times, and the results in this case are not entirely satisfactory. There are evident signs of hasty revision. The author has removed some once topical references, but we still read, in a book bearing the date 1949, of 'the harmony which the League of Nations is trying to establish' (p. 94), and more than once books are referred to as recent or just published which can no longer properly be so described. We are told that Rudolf Steiner's ideas have recently attracted much attention (p. 108 n.: the whole note dates badly, and could well have been jettisoned), and sentences such as 'thirty or forty years ago mechanistic theories were attempting to formulate out of existence the mysteries of the universe' (p. 113) remain unchanged in spite of the passage of nearly twenty years. It is a pity, one feels, that Professor Haarhoff did not either leave the old book alone or give us a completely new one.

This is not to say that the book as it now appears does not contain much that is interesting. Professor Haarhoff approaches the classics with an alert and sympathetic mind, and is quick to note points of contact between the ancient and the modern world. He is well worth reading on such matters as the similarities between the old Roman character and that of the Vortrekkers, between Stoicism and Calvinism, and between Roman farming methods and those of South Africa. His aim is to show that Virgil 'in virtue of his universality touches the experience even of so new a country as South Africa' and that rightly interpreted he has a meaning for the world to-day. He carries out his task of interpretation with tact, avoiding the pitfalls of collecting isolated *sortes* and of making Virgil more of a preacher than he was. At times, however, one has a slight suspicion that he is reading his own views into his text. *Excudent alii . . .* has to be explained away. 'It is impossible to believe that Vergil meant to encourage Rome to neglect art and science' (p. 93). It is certainly difficult. Yet here if anywhere Virgil seems to speak unambiguously to his countrymen. We remember

¹ It is perhaps worth noting that A is far commoner than B. The proportion in *Aen.* ii is about three to one. The actual numbers, too, are small.

In *Aen.* i, though admittedly there is no case of B in the first or fourth foot, there is also no case of A (except a *quo* in l. 331) in the first foot, and (again excepting two instances of *quo* in ll. 517 and 544) only one (l. 545) in the fourth.

too that even in the underworld the enmity of Greeks and Trojans is not forgotten, and that Virgil has no tears to shed over the destruction of the famous cities of Greece. There are limits to Virgil's sympathies. The limits were no doubt imposed by his patriotic theme, but one can hardly dismiss the patriotism as not a part of the real Virgil.

In the new Introduction Professor Haarhoff advances an ingenious interpretation of *Aen.* vi. 896 'sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia manes'. Virgil, he suggests, means that the visions sent through the gate of ivory appear false and unreal to the world above; *ad caelum* has in addition to its obvious meaning a second meaning, 'in the eyes of the material world', and in this sense is to be taken with *falsa*. Such visions are really true, did man but know it. It is very doubtful whether this interpretation can be accepted. Even if we grant the possibility of a hidden second meaning, could *caelum* mean the material world as opposed to the world of the spirit, and could *ad* with an adjective like *falsus* mean 'in the eyes of'?

M. L. CLARKE.

University College, Bangor.

Tacitus on Britain and Germany. A New Translation, by H. MATTINGLY. Pp. 174; 2 maps. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1948. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.

THIS Penguin volume contains, besides a translation of the *Agricola* and the *Germania*, a literary and historical introduction, some textual and general notes, a glossary, a bibliography and two maps, and the whole is the work of Dr. Mattingly. This is certainly very good value for the price, and would still be good value if the price were higher.

The book should be judged mainly as an attempt to present to the general reader an impression of two important works of Latin literature. Dr. Mattingly says that he has tried to render Tacitus into 'natural modern English', and he admits that 'a translation is not really true to him unless it carries with it something of his sombre magnificence and his mordant wit'. Every reader of this translation will have his own opinion: to me the Tacitus that it presents seems to be a dignified, cultured, and old-fashioned man of abrupt manner with the habit of using occasional modern colloquialisms. For example: 'So much is on the record', 'He got to know his province. He learned from the experts', '... you were a philosopher if you lay low', '... to check over ...'. Such phrases are certainly modern, and the only purpose in mentioning them here is to suggest that they do not mix easily with the rather formal language of the greater part of the translation. 'Harshness, arrogance and greed had long ceased to be part of his make-up. He succeeded where few succeed; he lost no authority by his affability, no affection by his sternness.' This combination of the formal and informal may not displease all readers, and all will admit that the translation as a whole is forceful and scholarly. The introduction and general notes are straightforward, sensible, and helpful.

It may appear doubtful whether the brief critical notes were worth including in a book of this kind, and the title of the whole work is open to the two-fold criticism that it may mislead those who know their Tacitus and that it removes from the cover, the most conspicuous part of the book, the title *Agricola* which is so well established and so much a part of our literary tradition.

J. A. H. WAY.

University of Glasgow.

Scriptores Christiani Primaevi. Vol. I: S. Caecilii Cypriani *Scripta Quaedam* recensuit J. N. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK. Pp. 80. Vol. III: S. Aureli Augustini *Enchiridion, De Catechizandis Rudibus* edidit A. Sizoo. Pp. 175. The Hague: Daamen, 1946, 1947. Cloth, fl. 3.50, 6.50.

THESE are two volumes of a promising series of handy editions of patristic texts, well printed and neatly produced (though the later volume does not reach the high standard of the earlier) at a cheap price. The series is designed to supply the pressing post-war need for students' texts, and it will be welcomed by all those who find the fuller critical editions beyond their means or unobtainable. The volume of Cyprian contains the *Ad Donatum, De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate*, and *De Lapsis*. No attempt has been made in either volume to construct a new text; that was not to be expected in a work of this type; but a few variant readings have been inserted, the famous Petrine addition of the Munich manuscript of *De Cath. Eccl. Unit.* being given in full. It would have contributed very greatly to the usefulness of the series for the purpose for which it is intended if some brief notes on the subject-matter and the language could have been included for the benefit of those new-comers to the study of the Fathers and the reading of later Latin who ought to be most attracted to these handy editions. Had an index been provided, it would have been still better. Apart from these deficiencies, however, they are competently produced little books.

G. W. H. LAMPE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

Bernardus Henricus STOLTE: *De Cosmographie van den Anonymus Ravennas.* Een Studie over de Bronnen van Boek II-V. (Amsterdam doctoral dissertation.) Pp. xi+130 (summary in English, pp. 116-22). Zundert, Holland: privately printed, 1949. Paper.

THIS geographer of the Dark Ages (say A.D. 670) has lists of place-names showing close affinities with the Peutinger Map. He professes to use chiefly one Castorius, among various authorities (many are otherwise unknown and have been reasonably suspected as spurious). K. Miller inferred that he transcribed wholesale from this man's work, which was a map, the same as the Peutinger (of about A.D. 365). Stolte reviews manuscripts and editions and recent literature, and gives a detailed analysis of Books II-V (pp. 26-105). It is concluded that Anon. really used the obscure sources he mentions, which were writings rather than maps, though

most went back to a map; this was some older and better Roman road-map, one possibly of Caracalla's time, from which the Peutinger was itself derived. Stolte's treatise is learned and valuable; he might relax more often from the austerities of a doctoral thesis to discuss the ultimate classical sources, as on the Nile (pp. 50-2), and to explain the exact worth (or worthlessness) of his writer's data for the general history of geography.

J. O. THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

Piero MELONI: *Il Regno di Caro Numeriano e Carino*. (Annali della Facoltà di Lettere et Filosofia dell' Università di Cagliari, XV. ii.) Pp. 223. Cagliari: University, 1948. Paper, L. 1200.

ALL contributions to the history of that obscure but momentous period, the late third century A.D., are welcome. In this monograph Dr. Meloni has made an exhaustive study of the brief reigns of Carus and his two sons. On each point the whole of the evidence has been diligently assembled and carefully weighed. Full use is made of the numismatic material; the imperial titles and legends appearing on the coins are systematically set out in an appendix. But in the main the author has to do his best to extract the truth from the romantic biographies of the *Historia Augusta* and the jejune chroniclers of the fourth and fifth centuries. Perhaps the most valuable part of Dr. Meloni's work is the careful collation of these sources and his reconstruction of the 'imperial chronicle' on which all appear to have drawn. One example may serve to illustrate the problems which face the historian of this period. According to the *Historia Augusta* there was such diversity of opinion as to Carus' birthplace that the author despaired of discovering the truth, merely citing the statements of Onesimus that Carus was born at Rome of Illyrian parents, and of Fabius Ceryllianus that he was born in Illyricum of Punic parents. On the other hand, the chroniclers—Aurelius Victor, the author of the epitome *de Caesaribus*, Eutropius, Orosius, and others—unanimously and without hesitation say that Carus came from Narbo. This then must have been the version of the 'imperial chronicle', which was certainly known to and used by the author of the *Historia Augusta*. Whatever be the truth—and Dr. Meloni decides in favour of the 'imperial chronicle', partly on the ground that Carus is a *cognomen* common in Gaul and not often found elsewhere—it remains a puzzle why the author of the *Historia Augusta*, while throwing emphasis on the problem of Carus' birthplace and citing two authorities of very dubious value, should have ignored the statement of his best sources.

A. H. M. JONES.

University College, London.

Francisco Rodríguez ADRADOS: *El sistema gentilicio decimal de los Indoeuropeos occidentales y los orígenes de Roma*. Pp. 185. Madrid: Consejo de Investigaciones Científicas, 1948. Paper.

THIS interesting monograph, which has a summary in very fair English at the end, is No. VII of the

series *Manuales y anejos de 'Emerita'*, put forth by the Instituto 'Antonio de Nebrija'. It starts from a famous and much-discussed passage of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *A.R.* ii. 7. According to that, Romulus divided his people into three tribes, each tribe into ten *curiae* and each *curia* into ten smaller parts, presumably *decuriae*, for each had a *decurio* at the head of it. Adrados's theory is that, neglecting Romulus of course, this is a nearly right account of the pre-Servian constitution of Rome. The tribe falls into ten *decuriae*, *curia* being properly the meeting-place, not the unit, every *decuria* is a collection of ten *gentes*, and every *gens* sends a representative to the Senate and also, in war, must contribute ten footmen and a horseman to the tribal levy. Furthermore, he believes that this was the ancient system on which all the Wiro-speaking peoples of the west were primitively organized, witness among other things the Germanic hundred, the Welsh *cantref*, and the Hundred Houses of the Locrians. Subdivisions were possible when a *decuria* or a tribe grew too large, which explains for instance the Osc-Umbrian *pumpefies*. The arguments are very plausible, and I am inclined to agree, with the modification that I doubt if *centum*, 'hundred' and their cognates originally meant precisely 10 × 10; compare the English long hundred, the hundreds of Yorkshire, and the varying strength of a *centuria*.

His investigations take the author into some very curious and difficult places. Perhaps the most interesting digression is the long discussion (pp. 57-106) of the Iguvian Tables, II b, 1 ff., with its mysterious direction *tekvias famefias pumpefias XII*. This he believes means *decuriae gentes senatus duodecim*; the 'twelve' are the twelve *fratres Atiedii* and a verb meaning *adsunto* is to be supplied. This at least makes sense, which is more than can be said for some of the other interpretations; whether it will stand up to minute philological criticism is another matter.

The printer, who is none too accurate in dealing with his native Spanish, has but a stormy passage through the English summary. The proof-reading might have been better done.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

A. BRELICH: *Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom*. (Albae Vigiliae, Heft VI.) Pp. 65. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1949. Paper, 8 Sw. fr.

THIS is a rather fantastic little work. That Rome had a secret tutelary god, or at least one whose name might never be mentioned, we know from several ancient authors, some of whom tell the story in the form that the city itself had a secret name. There is no particular reason to doubt either statement or to discredit the ancient explanation, that both secrets were carefully kept lest an enemy get hold of one or the other and make hostile use of the knowledge. But this is as much as we are ever likely to know, and the ancient guesses as to what the divine name, or the name of the city, might be are as idle as such things usually are. Brellich, who holds a post at the

University of Rome and has published some good work on ancient religion, starts with some consideration of the Genius and the Fortuna of cities; he makes the interesting observation (p. 13) that a Genius is not necessarily a begetter, for a man may be *genitus* from his mother; hence the very rare mentions of the Genius of a woman may go back to early ideas. Either sex can reproduce. Thence, by way of the formula *si deus si dea* and some consideration of bisexual deities, he wanders off to sundry pairs of male and female powers (they include the two Pales, also Iuno Sispes and her snake) who may be considered the tutelary god and goddess of this or that place. The monograph ends with some rather vague remarks of a psychological nature, and throughout it is deficient in the necessary distinction between evidences from different dates and spheres of cultural influence. Some old familiar blunders are made (Mater Matuta as a dawn-goddess, p. 23; Consus and *consilium*, p. 42), also one or two new ones (the Nonae Caprotinae do not take their name from Iuno's goat, p. 31, but from the *caprificus* which played a part in the ritual), and highly doubtful statements abound. I have noted but one serious misprint, p. 48, where a reference to Varro, *de lingua Latina*, has been transformed into the mysterious symbols 'C.C.' H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

JULIO MARTÍNEZ SANTA-OLALLA: *Esquema Paleológico de la Península Hispánica*. 2ª Edición. Pp. 156; 64 plates. Madrid: Seminario de Historia Primitiva del Hombre, 1946. Paper, 45 pesetas.

SANTA-OLALLA's purpose here has been to supersede the conventional grouping of the various cultures recognized in Spanish and Portuguese prehistory and proto-history by a new and tidy scheme, which he hopes (at all events in this second, somewhat revised, edition) may be accepted as definitive, both in nomenclature and dating. That this is rather too much to expect as yet for the Old and Middle Stone Ages will scarcely cause surprise; but for the Neolithic, Chalcolithic, and Bronze Ages one might have expected a greater measure of success from his efforts than can actually be conceded. For the conventional accounts of these periods were surely right at least in recognizing in them already that regional diversity which still presents the greatest single problem in the Peninsula's development: Santa-Olalla, determined to simplify this into a succession of unitary cultures following on each other, succeeds only in over-simplifying. Thus would-be students of proto-historic contacts between Spain and the other end of the Mediterranean should be warned that his 'Bronce Atlántico I' (1200-900 B.C.) and 'II' (900-650 B.C.) are highly artificial constructions, both in their chronology and their ethnology; his scheme for the Celtic invasions from beyond the Pyrenees rides roughshod over too much; and there is no real reason whatever for making a general Iron Age begin at 650. Within that age, indeed, he at least must acquiesce in the well-known division

of the Peninsula between Celtic and Iberian cultures, and make allowance for their regionalism; nevertheless, his two-period system (650 to 350, 350 to Caesar) is quite unreasonably rigid.

The numerous plates are very welcome, and reproduce some little-known as well as many well-known things. But archaeologists will not, and non-archaeologists must not, sit back and think they are getting from Santa-Olalla anything authoritative, firm, and soothing. What they are getting is a stimulant; and its value should appear in healthy reactions provoked.

C. F. C. HAWKES.

Keble College, Oxford.

A. ALBENQUE: *Les Rutènes. Études d'Histoire, d'Archéologie et de Toponymie Gallo-Romaines*. Pp. xii+341; 11 plates, 22 figs. Paris: Picard, 1948. Paper, 550 fr.

M. ALBENQUE has followed up his inventory of the Gallo-Roman archaeology of the Aveyron by this book, which conveys a clear picture of the Civitas Rutenorum, its economy and its settlements, as far as these are known. Though the Ruteni occupied an upland region, they were on the borders of Gallia Narbonensis, and their rapid economic development need not be surprising. The pottery of La Graufesenque is the outstanding Rutenian industry, but M. Albenque treats in greater detail the lesser-known industries of resin-extraction and mining—the argentiferous lead-mines near Villefranche or Millau, and the copper carbonate of Bouche-Payrol. The silver of the Ruteni is mentioned by Strabo, and an inscription of the time of Tiberius shows that the mines were important enough to be under imperial control. After the first century A.D. these industries all suffered eclipse. La Graufesenque could no longer compete with the more centrally situated Lezoux, and the mines of Spain and Britain drove lesser rivals from the field. The Rouergue was left to its agricultural and pastoral products, from which it derived considerable wealth, to judge from its villas and other sites. These suffered, along with the rest of Gaul, in the invasions of c. 275, and Segodunum (Rodez), to which one of M. Albenque's studies is devoted, was rebuilt on a very reduced scale. The great aristocrats now tended to withdraw more and more to their country estates, and the finest villas which have been excavated belong to the late empire. On these great domains the transition to the Middle Ages came about imperceptibly. In the latter part of the fifth century Sidonius Apollinaris writes to a friend in the Rouergue whose *castellum* he is about to visit.

No study of an area of Roman Gaul can afford to neglect its place-names, and M. Albenque's work on the Aveyron is a useful complement to M. Dauzat's work on Auvergne and the Velay. He gives distribution-maps of names ending in *-ac*, which in most cases go back to Roman domains ending in *-acum*, and of names to which a Celtic origin can be ascribed. Their significance would have been more striking had it been possible to show them on the same scale as the map of Gallo-Roman finds.

M. Albenque's manifold activities have included investigation of the chief Roman roads of his region; his three chapters on these will be read with interest by our road enthusiasts. On the historical side he discusses the origin of the 'Ruteni provinciales' mentioned by Caesar (*B.G.* vii. 7) whose territory later became the Albigeois; he believes that the partition of the tribe was the work of Fonteius. Yet another study is the account of Celtic survivals, some of which have lingered on in local folk-lore up to the present day.

M. Albenque is well aware of the many gaps in the story of the Ruteni. He points out that only a little of the famous site of La Graufesenque has been explored. The last important excavation there took place in 1906 and exploration by modern methods would be extremely fruitful. We would also like to know more of the sister pottery of Montans, in the Tarn, and whether great villas like that at Bas-Marcou had a series of dependent dwellings and workshops like those at Anthée in Belgium.

We hope that little settlements, like that of Carantomagus, will in time be excavated and planned and also, if this is still possible, we would like to see drawings and photographs of any remains of the aqueduct of Segodunum. M. Albenque's work is so stimulating that we hope he will forgive us for asking for more.

OLWEN BROGAN.

Cambridge.

Philip V. HILL: *'Barbarous Radiates', Imitations of Third Century Roman Coins.* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 12.) Pp. 44; 4 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1949. Paper.

IN recent years a controversy has been raging among numismatists concerning the origin and date of so-called barbarous radiates—coins struck in imitation of the official third-century Roman coins, which bore on their obverse the head of the emperor crowned with a radiate crown. Mr. Hill has made a gallant attempt to throw fresh light on this thorny question, but, possibly because, as he himself admits, 'we have only just begun to touch the fringe of the subject', the effect has been rather to emphasize the difficulties of the problem than to solve them.

Mr. Hill is undoubtedly right in declaring that barbarous radiates, and even barbarous radiate minims—coins whose diameter is less than half an inch—began to be produced before the end of the third century A.D. The evidence of third-century Roman coin hoards containing barbarous radiates, it has for some time been recognized, proves this conclusively. Mr. Hill is by no means on such sure ground, however, when he argues that radiate minims continued to appear until at least the sixth century A.D. The Romano-British hoards which he cites in support of this thesis have been placed in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. on purely arbitrary, subjective, grounds, and not on evidence which would be acceptable to any archaeologist. It is quite possible that they are of so late a date, but they have never yet been proved to be so.

In dealing with the place of origin of barbarous copies Mr. Hill seeks to prove the existence of regional centres for their production in Britain, but once again rather outruns his evidence. His serious treatment of the whole subject of barbarous radiates, however, should encourage a more careful study of them in the future, when found on Roman sites or in hoards. Through such a study the problem of barbarous radiates may yet be solved.

ANNE S. ROBERTSON.

University of Glasgow.

Pierre GUILLON: *La Béotie Antique.* Pp. 111; 32 plates. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1948. Paper.

A FRENCHMAN, hearing about a book which a friend of his was projecting, inquired 'Plutôt scientifique, ou plutôt lyrique?' The work under review is *plutôt lyrique*. It is not a history, and it is not a topographical work; it assumes a knowledge of the former, and refers the reader to the *Guide bleu* for the details of the latter. It is in fact an essay, and a very pleasant one, in some 35,000 words, on the character of the Boeotian country and people, on their contribution to ancient Greek civilization (illustrated by copious extracts in translation, especially from Hesiod and Pindar) and on *l'histoire d'un préjugé*, the anti-Boeotian prejudice which will presumably always be with us while men remember Athens. The author has fallen under the spell of his subject since the days when he worked in Boeotia as a young archaeologist.

The illustrations (48 photographs) are not a mere adjunct, but genuinely illustrate the text. The topographical photographs cover many of the less-known sites, and are excellent; the reproduction is fair.

The Boeotia best known to M. Guillon lies round about Kopais and the Ptoion. If one may be permitted a complaint, it is that—except for a perfunctory visit to the Vale of the Muses—he shows us nothing of Helicon and the south coast sites. But he deserves gratitude for his contribution towards 'putting on the map' a good Greek region with a character all its own; that region 'painted in oils, whereas Attica is painted in watercolour' that you suddenly reach when you come over the col by Eleuthérai. If this essay—written in 1935, published in 1948—encourages some travellers to cross Cithaeron or to 'stop off' on the way between Athens and the north, it will have justified itself as a contribution to Hellenic studies.

A. R. BURN.

University of Glasgow.

R. E. WYCHERLEY: *How the Greeks built Cities.* Pp. xxi+228; 16 plates, 52 figs. London: Macmillan, 1949. Cloth, 16s. net.

THE author's object is to trace the growth of the various types of building that made up an ancient Greek city, and to show how they conformed to the requirements of its life. No special knowledge is demanded of the reader, and the general tone of adulation conveys a sense of propaganda, yet it would be unjust to describe this merely as a

popular book. Of course any such compilation must take account of a great body of material which scholars have already assembled and analysed for much the same purpose, and the addition of recent discoveries tends rather to supplement than to modify their conclusions, but Professor Wycherley has done a valuable service by restating the position. (The only important omission I have noticed is that of the seventh-century rectilinear township at Vrulia.) As he is not primarily an archaeologist he has perhaps relied overmuch on his predecessors and not given enough attention to the excavation reports from which they drew their facts, for sometimes he presents the information accurately enough but lifelessly, with the monotony in structure and flavour of predigested food; where he has thought for himself he is capable of delightfully simple wording which makes a perfect vehicle for his reflections. Unfortunately he had not the specialist's knowledge required for balanced generalizations of a few pages upon such intricate matters as the development of temples or military architecture, and further consideration of some of his main topics would have been advisable; the implications of the Greek habit of building on hilly sites should have dominated his comparisons with oriental and Roman planning, which was designed for flat ground.

One source of complication arises from the chronological limit adopted; he does not include the Hellenistic age in its own right, though he is obliged to describe many of its buildings because they are the best examples of types developed earlier. And, as a matter of fact, remains of a later date than 300 B.C. are shown, occupying either the whole or a part, in the majority of the illustrations. These should arouse much interest, though they are very uneven in quality. In Fig. 24 the plan of the Thersilion is carelessly drawn.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

HERMANN USENER: *Götternamen. Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung. Dritte unveränderte Auflage.* Pp. x+391. Frankfurt a/M: Schulte, 1948. Paper.

FIFTY-THREE years after the first appearance of this classic of its subject, a new edition of 2,500 copies has been put out. This is not the place or the time to criticize the contents, now in some measure out-dated, or even to analyse the abiding value of Usener's theories, which would need a long discussion. The reprint is not anastatic, but reproduces the original text so nearly page for page that anyone looking up a reference will be under no greater inconvenience than occasionally seeking the last dozen words of p. x at the top of p. x+1, or some slight adjustment of that kind. For reasons only too easy to understand, the paper is both thicker and of poorer quality than that used for the original edition of 1895, but the type is clear and good. Usener's habit of writing his substantives with a lower-case initial, as English and French do, has been indulged, but his spelling has been brought into accordance with more modern

methods, *ungetheille*, for instance, appearing as *ungeteille*. Sanskrit and Lithuanian words have had to go without certain diacritical marks, for technical reasons.

The book is adorned with a good portrait of the author and has a short preface by Nilsson, besides a reprint of the preface to the second edition, by the late Eduard Norden. On the inside of the back cover there is a short life of the author, with a bibliography of his chief works and a few remarks concerning the present reprint.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

CARL-MARTIN EDSMAN: *Ignis Divinus. Le feu comme moyen de rajeunissement et d'immortalité: contes, légendes, mythes et rites.* (Skriften utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten Lunds, 34.) Pp. 306; 1 pl. Lund: Gleerup, 1949. Paper, kr. 13.

THIS is a doctoral dissertation, the French text of which is here and there damaged by misprints, while an occasional mistranslation slightly mars some of the classical references. From the nature of the subject, most of the contents are not within the range of interests of this Review, and I hope to deal with them in a notice in *Folk-Lore*. A quite widespread tale consists of or contains an account of how someone was brought to life, made young, or cured of a serious disease by a process involving the use of fire, whether that of a stove or oven, a forge or a funeral pyre. The author seeks to determine whether any such stories go back to any kind of ritual, and if so, then of what country and age. As he is no dogmatist and will not assume a theoretical explanation, however tempting, without some positive evidence in its favour, he often arrives at negative conclusions, to which he honestly draws attention (p. 9). It would seem, indeed, that his research is erected on the ruins of an earlier attempt, unpublished, 'dont la thèse s'est révélée chimérique' (p. 8). His first chapter points out on what shaky foundations the elaborate edifice of the supposed annual sacrifice of Melqart or some other Oriental deity corresponding in popular opinion to Herakles has been reared. Then, after a long and meritorious investigation of tales dating from the Middle Ages, in which he can find no trace of ritual origins, he rejoins antiquity in Chapter III, with the various accounts of Indian peoples or castes the members of which often burn themselves alive when they think they have lived long enough. Only a very late source (Honorius of Autun) says they hope to attain future bliss thereby; Edsman suggests that here the legend of the Phoenix has had an influence (p. 166). Hence, after an excursus (pp. 166-78) on the death by fire of sundry Christian martyrs, he passes to a consideration of the Phoenix (pp. 178-203), and here, besides the influence of philosophic speculations on the element of fire, he supposes a certain possibility of connexion with the mystery-religions of late times. He then (Chapter IV) treats first of Neoplatonic ideas concerning the purifying and other powers of fire, next of the accounts, mythical and historical, in which fire appears as something

other than a merely destroying or even a merely purifying agent. He starts from late passages (Eustathios on A 53 and a few words of Martianus Capella, ii. 142, the latter of which he comments upon in some detail) and then deals with the use of fire in the mysteries of Mithra (pp. 219 ff.), the legend of Demophon (pp. 224-9), where he regards, correctly, those theories which give the story a ritual background as unproved, the resuscitation by fire of Skylla (pp. 229-33), and the death of Herakles (pp. 233-49). Here his examination of the relations between the real fire-rite on Mt. Oite and the later ramifications and applications of the story is very judicious and his conclusions sound: 'Quelle que soit la relation originelle entre le mythe et le rite, on a . . . fait appel au mythe de la mort d'Héracles sur le bûcher pour légitimer de nouveaux rites qui contiennent de toute évidence l'idée d'apothéose. Le mythe d'Héracles constitue donc un bon exemple des variations qui peuvent exister dans la relation entre mythe et rite' (p. 249).

Finally, the last chapter (V) turns to the recorded deaths by fire of Indian ascetics, of whom Kalanos is the most famous. Here at last there is something like a genuine ritual background, the rite of *agni-praveśa*, which is sufficiently attested by Indian sources and serves also to support the substantial historicity of the Greek accounts, however much some of them may have been coloured by Hellenic, mostly Cynic, ideas.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Dumbarton Oaks Papers. Number Four. Edited for the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection of Harvard University. Pp. 305; 15 plates, plans. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 42s. net.

THIS volume contains five studies in the fields of late classical and Byzantine civilization. Professor A. A. Vasiliev describes the finding of nine porphyry sarcophagi in which certain Byzantine emperors were buried up to 1028 in the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. He draws on his unrivalled knowledge of Byzantine literary sources in attempting to determine the medieval fate of these tombs. Seven of them cannot be assigned to their individual occupiers, but Vasiliev considers that there is sufficient evidence to identify the round cylindrical sarcophagus of Julian the Apostate, and he puts forward a somewhat hypothetical suggestion concerning the tomb of Constantine the Great. In his second essay Vasiliev describes from an early-sixth-century monument in the Hippodrome of Constantinople the career of a famous charioteer Porphyrius, celebrated in the *Greek Anthology*, and from inscriptions and other sources he gives interesting details about life in racing circles in Constantinople. Both essays are admirably illustrated.

The literary form of the letters of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, an Eastern theologian of the fifth century, is examined by Sister M. Monica Wagner. She rightly points out that acceptance of the literary traditions of the ancient world does not necessarily

imply a slavish acceptance of rhetorical and epistolary conventions or the elimination of sincerity and true self expression. It may be added that the experience of those researching in both literary and other aspects of Byzantine civilization after Theodoret's day would increasingly support her conclusions.

In an exceedingly useful study Professor P. Charanis describes the attempt of the Byzantine government throughout the Middle Ages to protect the small free peasant owner and to limit the accumulation of property in the hands of monastic authorities and others. Any discussion of this problem inevitably involves vital issues—military and financial, for instance—of which some are still highly controversial and of which detailed discussion would be irrelevant here. This essay is not so much an original contribution to knowledge as a lucid (and for English-speaking students badly needed) discussion of the work of scholars over a number of years. Relevant material is still in process of being published, but those interested in Byzantine civilization will be grateful for this well-documented interim report.

The last contribution in the series is Professor M. Anastos's study of the fifteenth-century humanist George Gemistus Pletho's *Calendar and Liturgy*, based on part of his doctoral dissertation. With formidable footnotes in support he analyses the sources of the lunisolar calendar and the liturgical system, and attempts to show that Pletho, much as he was consciously indebted to pagan Greek traditions, could never completely break away from the rites and practices of the Orthodox Church. He then considers and rejects Täschner's contention that Pletho was influenced by the Islamic thought and practice with which he was undoubtedly familiar. He concludes with an examination of Pletho's use of the Zoroastrian tradition and the so-called *Oracula Chaldaica*, and here he makes a suggestive contribution towards an important, but too often neglected, factor in Byzantine thought.

JOAN HUSSEY.

Bedford College, London.

The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond. Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by H. E. BUTLER. Pp. xxviii+167. London and Edinburgh: Nelson, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS is the first volume of a new series, which aims at doing for some of the main works of medieval literature what the Loeb series has done for classical authors, giving Latin text and translation on opposite pages, with an introduction and critical and explanatory notes. It was a happy idea to begin with Jocelin of Brakelond, the monk who wrote the life of Samson, Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds from 1182 to 1212. It could not indeed be claimed that Jocelin represents the literary culture of his period at its highest. He is far less correct in style than his contemporary William of Newburgh; he is not a born man of letters like William of Malmesbury; he is not steeped in classical poetry like Richard of Devizes. Yet his biography of Abbot Samson is among the most attractive of medieval works. It gives us, with a

naïve charm not easily analysed, the living portrait of a remarkable man, as well as most interesting glimpses into the workings of a great monastery.

The text of this edition is an undoubted improvement on anything that existed before, and the introduction and notes contain all that is needed to enable a reader, even if he has little previous acquaintance with the Middle Ages, to understand the historical background. The translation (apart from a few cases where words have been omitted) is faithful, and extremely successful in reproducing the flavour of the original. Altogether the editor is to be congratulated on his work, which would well repay the attention not only of medievalists but also of classical scholars, who are sometimes too apt to assume that Latin literature ended with Juvenal.

K. R. POTTER.

University of Edinburgh.

Charles W. JONES: *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England*. Pp. xiii+232; 2 plates. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1947. Cloth.

THIS study of saints' lives and chronicles written in England before 750 is the first part of a trilogy in which Mr. Jones hopes to be able 'to formulate some of the principles which guided the authors of Western Europe during the five centuries preceding the first crusade'. In effect, he has written important chapters on the chronology and interpretation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, chapters which will fundamentally influence our understanding and appreciation of that book. The central theme is that Bede's words are not intended for material interpretation, that for Bede the *vera lex historiae*, the task of the *verax historicus*, is not so much to sift truth from falsehood as faithfully to give literary expression to popular opinion: hence the place of miracles in the History. Mommsen, Plummer, and Poole understood *verax historicus* differently. In the first three chapters the reader will find, *inter alia*, an analysis of the short annals at the end of the History, which are called *recapitulatio chronica totius operis*—Mr. Jones explains what a *recapitulatio* is—a discussion of the way in which annals developed from marginalia in Easter-tables, and a discussion of Bede's method of calculating his dates, with a long illustrative appendix, 'Time References in the Ecclesiastical History'. There is a common-sense solution to the vexed problem of the date at which Bede began his year in the History: 'in his statements lie buried as many new years as were employed in the sources from which he drew'. All this good learning consorts strangely with the English translations of the anonymous life of St. Gregory and the better-known life of St. Guthlac by Felix. Mr. Jones has put some gusto into his Guthlac ('with mouth agape in raucous hulla-baloo', 'barbaric yaup', 'deafening racket'), but, on the whole, the translations, a desperate task, are not successful.

N. R. KER.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

Leonard FORSTER: *Selections from Conrad Celtis, 1459-1508*, edited with translation and commentary. Pp. xii+123; 3 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

CONRAD PICKEL, later called Conrad Celtis Protucius, 'laureatus', pupil of Rudolf Agricola, friend of Dürer and Burgkmair, editor of Seneca's *Herc. Fur.* and *Thyestes*, discoverer of the works of Hrotswitha, of the medieval epic *Ligurinus*, and of the *Tabula Peutingeria*, first lecturer in Germany on Tacitus' *Germania*, and an eager *Wanderprediger des Humanismus*, found his special mission in the glorification of Germany in and through humanistic poetry. The present edition contains a selection of odes (two sapphic, one alcaic, one archilochian, one hendecasyllabic), two epigrams, and the inaugural *Oratio* delivered at Ingolstadt. The odes here printed do little to show that Celtis was not misled by unjustified optimism into hoping to go down to posterity as the German Horace. But the selection has been made by a Germanist more interested here in literary history than in poetic quality; and for a truer conception of the merits of Celtis the student should go to the complete texts of his *Amores*, *Odes*, *Epode*, and *Carmen Saeculare*. The *Oratio* contains some wise sayings, and the editor calls attention to the fact that 'like Fichte he maintains that sound learning and moral philosophy are in the last instance matters of national, not merely academic concern'.

Mr. Forster has produced this volume to meet the needs of the modern language student wholly or almost destitute of a knowledge of Latin, and he partially disarms the classical critic by declaring his translations to be meant only as 'cribs' without pretensions to elegance. But cribs, like texts, impose obligations on their editors, and not the least of these is strict accuracy. While in the Latin texts there are only a few readings that seem objectionable (*Ad Apoll.* 2 and 6; *Oratio* 14, 30, 38, 49, 104), in the translations there are numerous inaccuracies (*Ad Momm.* 14, 18; *Ad Sepul.* 12; *Ad Fusil.* 11 f., omission or transformation of the meaning of the emphatic *perge* in successive stanzas 33 ff., 43 f., 59, 76; *Oratio* 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, 22, 23, 25, 34, 39, 45, 49, 57, 60, 63, 64, 66, 69, 72, 79, 80, 84, 86, 94, 104, 110; *Amores* passages quoted on p. 77, and the passage from Rudolf Agricola on p. 104), omissions (*Ad Fusil.* 23; *Epigram* i. 2; *Oratio* 13, 15, 17, 23, 26, 27, 50, 63, 67, 94, 97, passage from Lazzaro Buonamico on p. 92), and unnecessary additions (*Oratio* 7, 16, 54, 60, 84). References can be supplied for two quotations in the *Oratio* described as 'not traced', viz. 46 (Claudian, *In Rufin.* 2. 527), 77 (*ibid.* 2. Praefatio, 7 f.). The text contains one misprint in *Oratio* 37 (*quarundam* for *quorundam*).

The introduction presents Celtis in his German humanistic setting with admirable brevity and good judgement. The only doubt that suggests itself is about the letter to Celtis from his former lover Hasilina. Is it not likely that Celtis himself is its author? The series of essays which serve as commentary to the texts, even if, as the author modestly declares, they have nothing new to say,

are well suited to satisfy their purpose of providing the background of the selected passages, and of showing their relation to the German literature of the time.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

Kenneth M. SETTON: *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388*. Pp. xv+323; 8 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1948. Cloth, \$7.50.

MR. SETTON has given his readers a carefully-written and well-documented account of the years of Catalan domination in Greece, from the day in 1311 when in the battle of the Cephissus the Frankish cavalry was defeated and Thebes and Athens fell into the hands of these extraordinary adventurers, until three-quarters of a century later when the Acropolis fell before the attack of Nerio Acciaiuoli and the rule of the Catalan Company was over for ever. These narrative chapters of the book are followed by an interesting account of the social and economic condition of Greece under Catalan rule; on pp. 225-40 we have a good account of the state of the monuments of Athens at the period, as recorded by such travellers as Cyriac of Ancona and Niccolò da Martoni, with some details of what the Parthenon was like as a church. The frontispiece is a photograph of the Propylaea showing the Frankish tower destroyed, to Freeman's dismay, in 1874; this appears again on Pl. VIII, a nineteenth-century drawing. With melancholy interest the reader may look at Pl. VII, a drawing showing the destruction of the Parthenon in 1687 by cannon fire: the Turkish minaret is shown and 'the centre of the building is being blown up. On the left of this plate is the Arch of Hadrian; near it the Olympieum, marked as 'Palazzo di Adriano', and in the distance Piraeus, 'Porto Lion'. The last chapter contains a detailed and critical account of the sources, primary and secondary, but the arrangement is not one that makes it always easy to trace a reference in the footnotes; the number of these show how carefully the sources have been followed. Among the moderns we have an admiring but discriminating account of the writings of the Catalan historian Rubió y Lluich, who in the nineteenth century was as much inspired by the almost fantastic hardihood of these soldiers of fortune as was their own contemporary Ramón Muntaner; now it is Rubió y Lluich's work that has interested Mr. Setton so

much that he has written this scholarly and useful book. To English readers it will carry on, but into very much greater detail and fullness, the late William Miller's writings on Frankish Greece, post-Byzantine and pre-Turkish.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Dorothy Burr THOMPSON: *Swans and Amber*. Some Early Greek Lyrics freely translated and adapted. Pp. xii+194. Toronto: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE somewhat cryptic title of this book is derived from Lucian, *de Electro*, who says that when he visited the river Eridanus, where the sisters of Phaethon were turned into poplars and wept tears of amber and the swans made sweet music, he found neither swans nor amber. Swans and amber are, therefore, used to typify an extinct kind of literature.

Strictly speaking, many of the poems here translated are not lyrical but elegiac, e.g. those of Solon and Theognis.

The book contains some good versions, e.g. those of Alcman 36 (p. 146) and Simonides 27 (p. 174), but the book as a whole cannot be described as very scholarly, and indeed the translator seeks to disarm criticism by stating that the poems are 'freely translated and adapted'. Firstly, many of the poems are described as 'restored', but we are not given the restored texts; secondly, fragments are arbitrarily connected together, e.g. three fragments of Sappho on p. 77 and six of Alcman on p. 171; thirdly, lines are arbitrarily omitted, as in Xenophanes on p. 29; lastly, mistranslations occur, e.g. in Alcaeus on p. 52 ποικιλόδεσσοι, an epithet of wild geese, is translated, 'whose long necks gleam like jewelry', whereas it means 'with speckled necks', and in Theognis on p. 167 the last two lines do not represent the original at all, and the version of the passage of Alcaeus on p. 61, which is only partly rendered, wanders very far from the text.

The printing and setting of the book is quite beyond praise, and the 'snatches from Greek vases' which adorn the pages have a charming effect and a list of the sources from which they are derived is given at the end of the book. The endpapers are adorned with an attractive map.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLV. 2 (APRIL 1950)

E. Laughton, *Sub-conscious Repetitions and Textual Criticism*: analyses Ciceronian instances of non-deliberate repetition, within a short space, of words and phrases or syntactical patterns and discusses the implications for textual criticism: such a repetition is not necessarily to be suspected.

L. R. Taylor, *Degrassi's Edition of the Consular and Triumphal Fasti*: reviews D.'s *Inscriptiones Italiae* xiii, fasc. i (1947), with special reference to the Fasti Capitolini: questions D.'s assignment of the Fasti to the 'Actian' arch of 30 B.C., and suggests that the arch to which they belonged, and of which the foundations survive beside the temple of Julius, was the 'Parthian' arch dedicated in 18-17 B.C.: the Fasti are then not an Augustan adaptation of

an earlier list but an official Augustan version. A. Aymard, *L'Organisation de la Macédoine en 167 et le Régime Représentatif dans le Monde Grec*: re-examines the question, with criticisms of J. A. O. Larsen in *C.P.* xlv. 73-90 and M. Feysel in *B.C.H.* lxx. 187-98. W. B. Stanford discusses Homer's use of *πολυ-* compounds applied to persons. S. Levin revives the explanation of *προσκήδης* in *Od.* 21. 35 as 'mournful', corresponding to the Homeric usage of *κῆδος*: in later writers the adj. changes its meaning as the noun does. E. L. B. Meurig Davies (1) in *Schol. Eur. Med.* 433 reads *Ἡρόδωρος* for *Ἡρόδοτος* and ascribes the quotation to the *Argonautica* of Herodorus of Heraclea; (2) in *Pap. Rylands* 493, col. ii, ll. 23-4 proposes *ῥᾶς πηγῆς* and *[κατεπαγῆς] ἦσεν*.

DIONISO

XII (N.S.), 4: OCTOBER 1949

The fascicule opens with an obituary notice of Arch. Sebastiano Agati, and contains the following papers: F. M. Pontani, *Lettura del 10 stasimo delle 'Trachinie'*: studies the development of the chief themes, especially those of Aphrodite and Deianira; details of text and interpretation are treated in the notes. C. Ferrari, *Saggio di versione poetica: l'Edipo a Colono di Sofocle, 1556-1665*. M. Untersteiner, *Le 'Coefore' di Eschilo: interpretazioni* (Parts II and III): continues from the previous fascicule the study of the *kommos*, with special reference to the conflict of *dikai* and the idea of a man's survival in his children; the notes deal with points of detail, among them *μαχαλαμύς*. G. L. Luzzatto, *L' 'Elettra' di Sofocle tradotta in olandese da Vondel*: a generally favourable criticism of this translation of 1639. Idem, *Traduzioni tedesche di Sofocle*: a critical comparison of the work of Böckh (*Antigone*), Marbach, Schöll, and Hartung (*Ajax*).

ERANOS

XLVIII. 1-2 (1950)

H. Frisk, *Die Stammbildung von θέμις*, argues that names beginning *Θεμιστο-* are compounded from a superlative of *θέμιος*, that *ἀθέμιτος* is an alternative for *ἀθέμιος*, modelled *metri gratia* on *ἀχάριστος*: *χάρις*, and that *θέμιτες* κτλ. are also metrically convenient forms invented by analogy with *Θεμιστο-* and *ἀθέμιτος*. A. M. Dale, *Stasimon and Hyporcheme*, shows that the ancient grammarians fell into confusion, which sometimes persists today, through thinking that a stasimon must be sung *standing*. O. Regenbogen, *Randbemerkungen zur Medea des Euripides*, offers opinions on 38-43, 785 and 949, 94, 127, 214-64, 272, 284, 292 ff., 376 ff. (where he argues that the Canosa vase is affected by other plays than that of Euripides), 529, 663-758, 739, 741, 776 ff., 820 (the nurse is not on the stage here: this facilitates the division of parts among the actors), 1052, 1077, 1056-66, 1123, 1174, 1181 ff., 1209, 1218, 1227, 1251-70, 887, 892, 995, 1293-1305, 1314 ff. S. Blomgren, *De P. Papinii Statii apud Venantium Fortunatum vestigiis*, collects parallel passages. K. E. Ingvarsson, *Ingens*

dans la poésie et chez Tacite, notes that the word belongs almost entirely to hexameter poetry and to prose-writers influenced by poetic diction; Tacitus uses it less frequently in the minor works. A. Hudson-Williams restores *influus* in *Paul. Nol. Carm.* 31. 444. B. Axelsson convincingly emends *inermis* to *eneruis* in *Sen. Herc. Oet.* 1721. S. Eitrem suggests that the *sator arepo* formula contains the phrase *net opera rota(n)s*, which he translates 'she (a deity, a demon, or perhaps the inscription itself) spins her works, revolving (either intr. or: rotating the spindle with its whorl, σφόνδυλος or turbo)'.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE

LXXVI. 1 (1950)

A. Ernout, *Tyrrhenus chez Virgile*: (1) *Aen.* 8. 526 *Tyrrhenus tubae clangor* suggests that *tuba* may be (like *lituus*) of Etruscan origin: the suggestion is confirmed by the ritual association of the *tuba* with the Quinquatrus and the cult of Minerva, themselves Etruscan; (2) *Aen.* 8. 458 *Tyrrhena vincula* suggests that *calceus* is not connected with *calx* but a borrowing from Etruscan (like *balleus*, and perhaps *puteus*, *clipeus*, *malleus*). M. Lejeune, *Les Noms d'Agent Féminins en Grec*: examination of usage points to a distinction (despite differences of origin) between *-τευπα/-τρια* and *-τρίς* corresponding to that between *-τωρ* and *-τρη* established by Benveniste. P. Courcelle, *Plotin et Saint Ambroise*: disputes the common view of A.'s attitude to philosophy in general and Neo-Platonism in particular, pointing to parallels with Plotinus in the sermons *De Isaac* and *De Bono Mortis*, which show that A. assimilated and adapted Neo-platonic doctrines, and suggesting that it was A. who first turned the thoughts of Augustine (who may have heard these sermons) to Neo-Platonism. J. Heurgon, *L'Effort de Style de Varron dans les Res Rusticae*: discusses V.'s conscious attempts, never long maintained, to secure stylistic effect by *concinntas* and *varietas*: while for Cicero the stylistic unit is the phrase, for Varro it is still the word. Notes et Discussions: P. Chantraine on Gallavotti's *Saffo e Alceo*; F. Chapoutier on *Le iscrizioni preelleniche di Haghia Triada*.

RIVISTA DI FILOGIA E DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA

N.S. XXVIII (1950), 1

A. Barigazzi, *Sulle fonti del Libro I delle Tuscolane di Cicerone*: second and last part of the article of which the first part was contained in vol. xxvi (*C.R.* lxxiii. 78). S. Accame, *Trasibulo e i nuovi frammenti delle 'Elleniche di Ossirinco'*: gives a new text of the fragments of *Hell. Ox.* first published by V. Bartoletti (*PSI* 13, 1949, i. 61 ff.), suggests that the new fragments refer to the siege of Thasos by Thrasybulus in 407, and goes on to discuss the relation of *Hell. Ox.* to Xenophon and to Ephorus-Diodorus. L. Petech, *Tolomeo ed i risultati di alcuni scavi archeologici sulle coste dell' Asia meridionale*: summarizes the evidence obtained from excavations in India, Malaya, Siam, and Indo-

China for the extent of Graeco-Roman trade with the Far East, and concludes that Ptolemy was right to regard Katigara (now identified with Go Oc Eo in Cochinchina) as the limit of Graeco-Roman commerce. I. Calabi, *Il sinedrio della lega di Corinto e le sue attribuzioni giurisdizionali* (Nota a Polibio, IX, 33, 11): discusses the meaning of

κοινὸν ἐκ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων . . . κριτήριον in the passage of Polybius, and argues that the κριτήριον is not to be identified with the *synedrion* of the League of Corinth, but was an *ad hoc* arbitral court assembled by Philip, as in the case of the Sciritis (SIG³ 665). Reviews. List of publications received.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Aalto (P.) Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, Tom. 62. 3.) Pp. 193. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Sciences, 1949. Paper.
- Amandry (P.) La mantique apollinienne à Delphes. Essai sur le fonctionnement de l'oracle. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 170.) Pp. 290. Paris: de Boccard, 1950. Paper.
- Andronikos (M.) Ἀρχαῖαι ἐπιγραφαὶ Βεποίας. Pp. 26; 4 plates. Thessalonika, 1950. Paper.
- Atzert (C.), Ax (W.) M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta. Fasc. 48: De Officiis tertium recog. C. A.; De Virtutibus iterum recog. W. A. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teub.) Pp. xlii+189. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Cloth and boards, \$3.07.
- Bate (W. J.) and others. Perspectives of Criticism. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 20.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Beyenka (M. M.) Consolation in St. Augustine. (Patristic Studies, Vol. LXXXIII.) Pp. xxiii+115. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1950. Paper, \$1.50.
- Bluck (R. S.) Plato's Life and Thought. Pp. 195. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Castorina (E.) Appunti di Metrica Classica. I: La prosodia di Commodoiano nella storia della metrica latina. Pp. 18. II: Sulla scansione 'sdrucchiola' nei metri giambici ed eolici. Pp. 27. Catania: Giannotta, 1950. Paper, L. 100, 150.
- Castorina (E.) Apuleia Poeta. Pp. 42. Catania: Giannotta, 1950. Paper, L. 180.
- Castorina (E.) Vox Rivuli. Carmina. Pp. 62. Catania: Giannotta, 1950. Paper, L. 300.
- della Corte (F.) Saffo. Storia e leggenda. Pp. 79. Turin: Gheroni, 1950. Paper.
- de Vogel (C. J.) Greek Philosophy. A collection of texts with notes and explanations. Vol. I: Thales to Plato. Pp. xi+318. Leiden: Brill, 1950. Cloth, gld. 19.
- Diehl (E.) Anthologia Lyrica Graeca. Fasc. 2. Editio tertia. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teub.) Pp. viii+116. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Cloth and boards, \$1.97.
- Drerup (H.) Ägyptische Bildnisköpfe griechischer und römischer Zeit. (Orbis Antiquus, Heft 3.) Pp. 28; 16 plates. Münster (Westf.): Aschen-dorff, 1950. Paper, DM. 2.50.
- Durrell (L.) Sappho. A play in verse. Pp. 187. London: Faber, 1950. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Durry (M.) Éloge Funèbre d'une Matrone Romaine (Laudatio Turiae). Texte établi, traduit et commenté. Pp. xcvi+83. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Paper.
- Eitrem (S.) Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament. (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. Supplet. XII.) Pp. 60. Oslo: Brøgger, 1950. Paper.
- Ferrero (L.) Cicerone: De Re Publica. Introduzione, testo e commento. (I Classici della Nuova Italia, 30.) Pp. xxii+235. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1950. Paper, L. 450.
- Fraenkel (E.) Aeschylus: Agamemnon. Vol. I, Prolegomena, Text, and Translation: pp. xvi+195, 2 plates. Vols. II and III, Commentary: pp. viii+850. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. Cloth, £4. 4s. net.
- Fullwood (N.) Cicero on Himself. Selections from the Works of Cicero illustrating his Life and Character. (Alpha Classics.) Pp. 117; 7 plates. London: Bell, 1950. Cloth, 3s.
- Goldman (H.) Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus. Vol. I. The Hellenistic and Roman Periods. Text: pp. 420. Plates: 276 plates, 9 plans. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, £11. 15s. net.
- Gombosi (O. J.) Tonarten und Stimmungen der antiken Musik. Pp. xv+148. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1950. Paper, kr. 25.
- Gould (H. E.) and Whiteley (J. L.) Virgil: Aeneid, Book XII. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary. (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xxv+176. London: Macmillan, 1950. Cloth, 3s.
- Gow (A. S. F.) Theocritus. Vol. I: Introduction, Text and Translation. Pp. lxxxiv+257. Vol. II: Commentary, Appendix, Indexes and Plates. Pp. 634; 15 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1950. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Grand (R.) L'Agriculture au Moyen Âge, de la Fin de l'Empire Romain au XVI^e Siècle. Pp. 740. Paris: de Boccard, 1950. Paper, 2,000 fr.
- Grant (M.) Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 116.) Pp. xviii+199; 8 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1950. Paper, \$5.
- Grant (M.) Roman Anniversary Issues. An Exploratory Study of the Numismatic and Medallic Commemoration of Anniversary Years, 49 B.C. to A.D. 375. Pp. xxiv+204; 2 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1950. Cloth, 21s. net.

- Guthrie* (W. K. C.) *The Greeks and their Gods*. Pp. xiv+388. London: Methuen, 1950. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Hadas* (M.) *A History of Greek Literature*. Pp. 327. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.
- Haight* (E. H.) *The Symbolism of the House Door in Classical Poetry*. Pp. ix+158. New York: Longmans, 1950. Cloth, \$3.
- Hemberg* (B.) *Die Kabiren*. Pp. 420. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1950. Paper, kr. 25.
- Hillbrunner* (O.) *Wiederholungs- und Motivtechnik bei Aischylos*. Pp. 87. Bern: Franke, 1950. Paper, 6 Sw. fr.
- Hospers-Jansen* (A. M. A.) *Tacitus over de Joden* (Hist. 5. 2-13). [With English summary.] Pp. 224. Groningen: Wolters, 1949. Paper.
- Housman* (A. E.) *Lucani Belli Civilis Libri X*. Pp. xxvi+342. Oxford: Blackwell, 1950. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Irmscher* (J.) *Götterzorn bei Homer*. Pp. 96. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1950. Paper.
- Jacoby* (F.) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Dritter Teil: Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Hörographie und Ethnographie). B. Autoren über einzelne Städte (Länder), Nr. 297-607. Pp. 8*+779. Leiden: Brill, 1950. Paper.
- Johnson* (C.) *Dialogus de Saccario*. With translation, introduction and notes. (Nelson's Medieval Classics.) Pp. lxiv+144. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1950. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Klingner* (F.) *Q. Horati Flacci Opera iterum recog.* F. K. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teub.) Pp. xxii+378. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Cloth and boards, \$3.75.
- Klotz* (A.) *C. Julius Caesar*. Vol. II: *Commentarii Belli Civilis*. Editio altera. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teub.) Pp. xxii+169. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Cloth and boards, \$2.35.
- Koestermann* (E.) *P. Cornelii Taciti libri quae supersunt*. Post C. Halm-G. Andresen septimum edidit E. K. Tom. II fasc. 1: *Historiarum libri*. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Lat. Teub.) Pp. 260. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Cloth and boards, \$3.07.
- Kurfess* (A.) *Appendix Sallustiana*. Fasc. 1: *Epistulae ad Caesarem*. Ed. tertia. Fasc. 2: *Invectivae*. Ed. altera emendata. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teub.) Pp. viii+28, vi+25. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Paper, \$0.60, 0.57.
- Lasserre* (F.) *Les Épodes d'Archiloque*. Pp. 332. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Paper.
- Leslie* (R. J.) *The Epicureanism of Titus Pomponius Atticus*. Pp. vii+76. Philadelphia, 1950. (Obtainable from W. H. Allen, 2031 Walnut St., Philadelphia 3.) Paper, \$1.50.
- Lobel* (E.) *A Greek Historical Drama*. (From Proc. of the Brit. Academy, XXXV.) Pp. 12. London: Oxford University Press, 1950. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- McDonald* (M. F.) *St. Augustine's De Fide Rerum Quae Non Videntur*. A Critical Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary. (Patristic Studies, Vol. LXXXIV.) Pp. xvi+147. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1950. Paper, \$1.75.
- Marmorale* (E. V.) *Naevius Poeta*. Introduzione bibliografica, testo dei frammenti e commento. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, Filol. Latina, Vol. VIII.) Pp. 268. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1950. Paper, L. 1,300.
- Marouzeau* (J.) *L'Ordre des Mots dans la Phrase latine*. III: *Les Articulations de l'Énoncé*. (Coll. d'Études Latines, XXIV.) Pp. 200. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949. Paper.
- Mattingly* (H.) *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*. Vol. V: *Pertinax to Elagabalus*. Pp. cclxvi+699; 97 plates (separately bound). London: British Museum, 1950. Cloth, £8. 8s. net.
- May* (J. M. F.) *Ainos: its History and Coinage*, 474-341 B.C. Pp. xvi+288; 10 plates, 2 maps. London: Oxford University Press, 1950. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Papantonioiu* (G. A.) *Observations on some historical epigrams*. Pp. 14. Privately printed, 1948. Paper.
- Papantonioiu* (G. A.) *Προβλήματα περί την συγγραφὴν τοῦ Ἡροδότου*. Pp. 115. Athens: Spyropoulos, 1949. Paper.
- Paratore* (E.) *Storia della Letteratura Latina*. Pp. 991. Florence: Sansoni, 1950. Paper, L. 1,400.
- Oliver* (J. H.) *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law*. Pp. xiv+179. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Olivieri* (A.) *Aetii Amideni Libri Medicinales V-VIII*. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, VIII. 2.) Pp. iv+554. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950. Paper, DM. 37.50.
- Philippson* (A.) *Die griechischen Landschaften*. Band I, Teil I: *Thessalien und die Spercheios-Senke*. Pp. 308; 4 maps. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1950. Paper, DM. 20.
- Richmond* (I. A.) *Archaeology, and the After-Life in Pagan and Christian Imagery*. (University of Durham: Riddell Memorial Lectures.) Pp. 57; 9 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1950. Limp cloth, 5s. net.
- Robinson* (D. M.) *Excavations at Olynthus*. Part XIII: *Vases found in 1934 and 1938*. Pp. xix+463; 267 plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, £10 net.
- Ryffel* (H.) *Μεταβολὴ Πολιτεῶν*. Der Wandel der Staatsverfassungen. (Noctes Romanae, 2.) Pp. 278. Bern: Haupt, 1950. Paper, 16 Sw. fr.
- Sharif* (M. M.) *Three Lectures on the Nature of Tragedy*. Pp. 105. Lahore: Ashraf Publications, 1950. Cloth, Rs. 5.
- Smith* (F. K.) *The Antigone of Sophocles*. A new dramatic translation. Pp. 68. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1950. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Starr* (C. G.) *The Emergence of Rome as Ruler of the Western World*. Pp. xi+145. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Paper, 8s. net.
- Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Volumen XI, fasciculus I. *Adiuvantibus G. Daux, G. Klaffenbach, M. N. Tod redigendum curavit J. J. Hondius*. Pp. 80. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1950. Paper.

- Syme (R.)* A Roman Post-Mortem. An Inquest on the Fall of the Roman Republic. (Todd Memorial Lecture, No. 3.) Pp. 20. Sydney: Australasian Medical Publishing Co., 1950. Paper.
- Waldschmidt (E.), Alsdorf (L.), Spuler (B.), Stange (H. O. H.), Kressler (O.)* Geschichte Asiens. Pp. viii+768; 12 maps. München: Bruckmann, 1950. Cloth, DM. 22.
- Wehrli (F.)* Straton von Lampsakos. (Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar, Heft V.) Pp. 83. Basel: Schwabe, 1950. Paper, 11 Sw. fr.
- Westrup (C. W.)* Introduction to Early Roman Law. Vol. IV: Sources and Methods. Book I: Primary Sources. Pp. 213. Copenhagen: Munksgaard (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Paper, 24s. net.
- Young (D.)* Chasing an Ancient Greek. Pp. 204. London: Hollis & Carter, 1950. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

APOLOGY

THE Editors regret that by an unaccountable oversight Professor E. A. Thompson's article on "Julian's Knowledge of Latin", which appeared in *C.R.* lviii (1944), pp. 49 f., was printed again in *C.R.* lxiv (1950), pp. 51 f., and they offer apologies both to their readers and to the author.

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Acropolis of Athens, dedications from, 144
 Adrados's *Estudios sobre el Léxico de las Fábulas Esópicas (en torno a las problemas de la hoine literaria)*, 34; his *El sistema gentilicio decimal de los Indoeuropeos occidentales y los orígenes de Roma*, 157
 Aeacides, 98
 Albenque's *Les Rutènes*, 158
 Alföldi's *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, 140
 Allan (D. J.) on Mugler's *Platon et la recherche mathématique de son temps* and Heath's *Mathematics in Aristotle*, 112
 Altamura's *Iacopo Sannazaro, De Partu Virginis*, 76
 Andrew's *Homer's Odyssey* translated, 33
 Archiv für griechische Lexikographie, 81
 Argenti and Rose's *The Folk-Lore of Chios*, 148
 Austin (R. G.) on *Some Oxford Compositions*, 71
 Baden's *Das Tragische*, 103
 Bakalakis's 'Ελληνικά Πραξοφόρα, 36
 Ball's *Nature and the Vocabulary of Nature in the Works of Saint Cyprian*, 77
 Bardon's *Quinte-Curce: Histoires*, 56
 Baynes (N. H.) on Hohl's *Maximini Duo Iuli Capitolini*, 122
 Bell (H. I.) on Johnson and West's *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*, 137
 Bengtson's *Einführung in die alte Geschichte*, 124
 Bibliotheka Meandra (Polish monographs), 3
 Bolton (J. D. P.) *A locus vexatus* in Lucan, 90
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 39, 79, 165
 Borleffs's *Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani libros de Patientia, de Baptismo, de Paenitentia*, 74
 Brelich's *Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom*, 157
 Brink (C. O.) on Ruysschaert's *Iuste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite*, 120
 Brogan (O.) on Albenque's *Les Rutènes*, 158
 Browning (R.) on Weinreich's *Römische Satiren*, 55; on Labourt's *Saint Jérôme: Lettres* (I), 58; on Ball's *Nature and the Vocabulary of Nature in the Works of Saint Cyprian*, 77
 Budé Texts: Theognis, 14; Quintus Curtius, 56; St. Jerome's *Letters* (I), 58; Herodotus VI, 73
 Burn (A. R.) on Charlesworth's *The Lost Province, or The Worth of Britain*, 136; on Guillon's *La Béotie Antique*, 159
 Butler's *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*, 161
 Callahan's *Four Views of Time in Ancient Philosophy*, 22
 Cambridge, Greek play at, 1
 candidus, 89
 Carrière's *Théognis: Poèmes Élégiques*, 14
 Cary (M.) on Howald's *Die Kultur der Antike*, 26; on Bengtson's *Einführung in die alte Geschichte*, 124
 Cary's *The Geographic Background of Greek and Roman History*, 61
 Cato Maior, political life of, 132
 Charlesworth's *The Lost Province, or The Worth of Britain*, 136
 Χαρίζης's *Περί του νόμου της συνθέσεως των ἡμμάτων ἐν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ Ἑλληνικῇ γλώσσῃ*, 154
 Chilver (G. E. F.) on Meloni's *Servio Sulpicio Rufo e i suoi tempi*, 36; on Cary's *The Geographic Background of Greek and Roman History*, 61; on Taylor's *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*, 134
 Cicero, relations with Crassus, 135
 Clarke (M. L.) on Haarhoff's *Vergil the Universal*, 155
 Classical Association, Bristol meeting of, 41
 Classical Philology summarized (XLIV 4), 37, (XLV 1), 78, (XLV 2), 163
 Cleve's *The Philosophy of Anaxagoras*, 108
 coins, 66, 77, 149, 159
 Columba (G. M.), publication to commemorate work of, 82
 Commemorative Studies in honor of Theodore Leslie Shear, 142
 Compositions, *Some Oxford*, 71
 Constantine, Christian policy of, 141
 Cook (R. M.) on Stillwell's *Corinth. Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. XV, Part I: The Potters' Quarter*, 147
 Corinth, American excavations at, 147
 Courcelle's *Les Lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (2me édition), 59
 David's *Gai Institutiones secundum Veronensis apographum Studemundianum et reliquias in Aegyptio repertas*, 74
 Davison (J. A.) on Rüegg's *Kunst und Menschlichkeit Homers*, 32; on Stanford's *The Odyssey of Homer* (II), 33; on van der Valk's *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey*, 54; on Severyns's *Homère III: L'Artiste*, 72
 Dawkins (R. M.) on Setton's *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388*, 163
 Delatte's (A.) *La Constitution des États-unis et les Pythagoriciens*, 153
 della Corte's *Catone Censore, la Vita e la Fortuna*, 132
 della Valle's *Menandro, I Contendenti*, 152
 de Vries's *Spel bij Plato*, 111
 differre, 93
 Dioniso summarized (XII 2, 3), 37-8, (XII 4), 164
 Dover (K. J.) *Plato Comicus: Πρῶτος* and 'Ελλάς, 5
 Dryoscephalae, location of, 11
 Dumbarton Oaks Papers (4), 161
 Earp (F. R.) on Nuchelmans's *Die Nomina des sophocleischen Wortschatzes*, 152
 Edsman's *Ignis Divinus*, 160
 Egypt in Byzantine period, 138
 Eranos summarized (XLVII 3-4), 38, (XLVIII 1-2), 164
 'Ερασιέλα 'Ελλήνων Φιλολόγων, 42
 Evans (E.) on van den Brink's *Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani libros de Praescriptione Haereticorum, adversus Praxeas* and Borleffs's *Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani libros de Patientia, de Baptismo, de Paenitentia*, 74
 Evans's *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*, 35
 Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques, congress organized by, 1, 81
 Festugière's *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (II), 117
 flavus, 88
 Fletcher's *Notes to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, 105
 Forbes (P. B. R.) *Hesiod versus Perses*, 82; on Adrados's *Estudios sobre el Léxico de las Fábulas Esópicas*, 34; on Solmsen's *Hesiod and Aeschylus*, 100; on Frisch's *Might and Right in Antiquity* (I),

- 125; on Χατζής's *Περὶ τοῦ νόμου τῆς συνθέσεως τῶν ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ Ἑλληνικῇ γλώσσῃ*, 154
- Fordyce (C. J.) on Hubbell's *Cicero: De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*, 74
- Forster (E. S.) on Andrew's *Homer's Odyssey* translated, 33; on Freeman's *The Philoctetes of Sophocles*, 34; on Warner's *Xenophon, the Persian Expedition*, 154; on Thompson's *Swans and Amber*, 163
- Forster's (L.) *Selections from Conrad Celtis*, 162
- Freeman's *The Philoctetes of Sophocles*, 34
- Friedländer's *Epigrammata*, 17
- Frisch's *Might and Right in Antiquity* (I), 125
- fugax, fugiens*, 13
- geometry, reasons for early knowledge of, Egyptian 12
- Goldschmidt's *Les Dialogues de Platon: Structure et Méthode dialectique and Le Paradigme dans la Dialectique platonicienne*, 20
- Gomme (A. W.) on Tod's *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (II), 27; on Robinson's *America in Greece: a Traditional Policy*, 76
- Gregor (D. B.) *Sophocles El. 610-11*: 87
- Grierson's *Verse Translation with special reference to translation from Latin*, 151
- Griffith (G. T.) on Jones's *Ancient Economic History*, 35
- Griffith (J. G.) on Oeri's *Der Typ der komischen Alten in der griechischen Komödie, seine Nachwirkung und seine Herkunft*, 73
- Guillon's *La Béotie Antique*, 159
- Haarhoff's *Vergil the Universal*, 155
- Hackforth (R.) on Koller's *Die Komposition des platonischen Symposions*, 19; on Callahan's *Four Views of Time in Ancient Philosophy*, 22; *Immortality in Plato's Symposium*, 43
- Halliday (W. R.) on Argenti and Rose's *The Folk-Lore of Chios*, 148
- Hamilton (W.) on Jaeger's *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, 106
- Hammerich's *Laryngeal before Sonant*, 77
- Hammond (N. G. L.) on Hönn's *Solon, Staatsmann und Weiser*, 29; on Martin's *La Vie internationale dans la Grèce des Cités*, 63
- Harrison (Jane), centenary of the birth of, 82
- Hawkes (C. F. C.) on Santa-Olalla's *Esquema Paleontológico de la Península Hispánica* (2a edición), 158
- Heath's *Mathematics in Aristotle*, 112
- Helmantica*, first number of, 42
- Hesiod's claim against Perses, 82
- Hesperia: Supplement VIII*, 142
- Higham (T. F.) on Grierson's *Verse Translation with special reference to translation from Latin*, 151
- Hill's *'Barbarous Radiates'*, 159
- Hippocratic corpus, projected Lexicon to, 81
- Hirst (G.) *Martial ii 14 14-18* (The would-be diner out), 53
- Historia*, first number of, 82
- Hohl's *Maximini Duo Iuli Capitolini*, 122
- Homer, projected Lexicon to, 81
- Hönn's *Solon, Staatsmann und Weiser*, 29
- Howald's *Die Kultur der Antike*, 26
- Hubbell's *Cicero: De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*, 74
- Hussey (J.) on *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (4), 161
- immortality in Plato's *Symposium*, 43
- inscriptions, Greek, 17, 27, 63, 144
- iron, first traces of, in E. Mediterranean, 96
- Iuvencus, oldest manuscript of, 95
- Jaeger's *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, 106
- Janáček's *Prolegomena to Sextus Empiricus*, 73
- Johnson and West's *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*, 137
- Jones (A. H. M.) on Meloni's *Il Regno di Caro Numeriano e Carino*, 157
- Jones (D. M.) on Hammerich's *Laryngeal before Sonant*, 77
- Jones's (A. H. M.) *Ancient Economic History*, 35; his *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*, 139
- Jones's (C. W.) *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England*, 162
- Kakridis's *Homeric Researches*, 99
- Kells (J. H.) *Demosthenes iv 21*: 46
- Kemball-Cook (B. H.) *Euripides El. 726-42*: 95
- Ker (N. R.) on Jones's *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England*, 162
- Kerferd (G. B.) *The First Greek Sophists*, 8
- Kleiner's *Alexanders Reichsmünzen*, 66
- Koller's *Die Komposition des platonischen Symposions*, 19
- Kosmopoulos's *The Prehistoric Inhabitation of Corinth* (I), 75
- Kotting-Menko's *Individu en Kosmos*, 33
- Labourt's *Saint Jérôme: Lettres* (I), 58
- Lampe (G. W. H.) on Courcelle's *Les Lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (2me édition), 59; on Waszink's *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima*, 123; on van den Brink's *S. Caecilii Cypriani Scripta Quaedam* and Sizoo's *S. Aureli Augustini Enchiridion, De Catechizandis Rudibus*, 156
- Latin, Julian's knowledge of, 51 [167]
- Laughton (E.) *Flavius* again, 88
- Lawrence (A. W.) on *Opuscula Archaeologica V*, 36; on Bakalakis's *Ἑλληνικά Τραπεζοφόρα*, 36; on Rodenwaldt's *Köpfe von den Südmetopen des Parthenon*, 37; on *Commemorative Studies in honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*, 142; on Wycherley's *How the Greeks built Cities*, 159
- Lee (R. W.) on David's *Gai Institutiones secundum Veronensis apographum Studemundianum et reliquias in Aegypto repertas*, 74
- Legrand's *Hérodote, Histoires, Livre VI*, 73
- Lejeune's (A.) *Euclide et Ptolémée*, 23
- Lejeune's (M.) *Traité de phonétique grecque*, 68
- litigation in Hesiod's day, 83
- Lobel's *A Greek Historical Drama*, 81
- Lockwood (J. F.) on Altamura's *Iacopo Sannazaro, De Partu Virginis*, 76; on Forster's *Selections from Conrad Celtis, 1459-1508*, 162
- Loeb Classical Library: *Cicero, De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*, 74; *Prudentius* (I), 119
- Long's *A Study of the Doctrine of Metempsychosis in Greece from Pythagoras to Plato*, 34
- Lorimer (H. L.) on MacKay's *The Wrath of Homer*, 96
- Lucas (D. W.) on Sedgwick's *Of Irony, Especially in Drama*, 102; on Baden's *Das Tragische*, 103
- Macdonald (C.) *Herodotus and Aristotle on Egyptian Geometry*, 12
- MacKay's *The Wrath of Homer*, 96
- Manson (T. W.) on Simon's *Verus Israel*, 30; on Evans's *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*, 35
- manuscripts, Greek, removal of European collections of, 70
- Marmorale's *Cato maior*, 132
- Martin's *La Vie internationale dans la Grèce des Cités*, 63
- Mattingly's *Tacitus on Britain and Germany*, 156
- Meander* (Polish classical journal), 3

- Meiggs (R.) on Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor's *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (II), 63
- Meloni's *Servio Sulpicio Rufo e i suoi tempi*, 36; his *Il Regno di Caro Numeriano e Carino*, 157
- Menander, reconstruction of the *Epitrepontes* of, 152
- Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor's *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (II), 63
- Meurig Davies (E. L. B.) Notes on Euripides, Lucretius, and Claudian, 94
- Meyer's *Römischer Staat und Staatsgedanke*, 31
- Milne (J. G.) on Seltman's *Masterpieces of Greek Coinage*, 149
- Milne (H. J. M.) An Emendation in Sappho, 53
- Milne's (J. G.) *Finds of Greek Coins in the British Isles*, 77
- Morrison (J. S.) Euripides *IT* 1390 ff. and Pindar *P.* 4. 202: 3
- Moss (H. St. L. B.) on Jones's *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*, 139
- Mozley (J. H.) on Thomson's *Prudentius* (I), 119
- Mugler's *Platon et la recherche mathématique de son temps*, 112
- Myres (J. L.) *Dryosephalae*, 11; on Olmstead's *The History of the Persian Empire*, 129
- navigation, some ancient processes of, 3
- nicknames from camp-life, 11
- Nougaret's *Traité de Métrique latine classique*, 25
- Nuchelmans's *Die Nomina des sophocleischen Wortschatzes*, 152
- oath, ordeal by, 86
- obliquio rivo, 12
- Oeri's *Der Typ der komischen Alten in der griechischen Komödie, seine Nachwirkung und seine Herkunft*, 73
- Olmstead's *The History of the Persian Empire*, 129
- Opuscula Archaeologica V.*, 36
- Palmer (L. R.) on Lejeune's *Traité de phonétique grecque*, 68
- papyri, 12, 81
- Paris, double name of, 97
- Peck (A. L.) on Verdenius and Wazink's *Aristotle: On Coming-to-be and Passing-away. Some Comments*, 154
- philosophers, theology of early Greek, 106
- Philosophical Quarterly*, first number of, 82
- Platnauer (M.) on Nougaret's *Traité de Métrique latine classique*, 25; on Strzelecki's *Studia prosodiaca et metrica*, 155
- Plato Comicus, the *Πρόπτες* and *Ἑλλάς* of, 5
- Πλάτων* (Greek classical journal), 42
- Potter (K. R.) on Butler's *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*, 161
- pottery, Corinthian, 75
- Poyser (G. H.) *Obliquio rivo*, 13
- Propontis, prevalent winter winds over, 90
- Prosopography of Later Roman Empire and of History of Christianity, 2
- Prudentius, literary style of, 119
- Pythagoreans, development of doctrines of, 110
- Raubitschek's *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*, 144
- Raven (J. E.) on Cleve's *The Philosophy of Anaxagoras*, 108
- Raven's *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*, 109
- Rees (D. A.) δὲ δῶν, 95; on Ross's *Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics*, 114
- Reinhardt's *Aischylos als Regisseur und Theologe*, 104
- Revue de Philologie* summarized (LXXV 2), 38, (LXXVI 1), 164
- Rheinisches Museum*, reappearance of, 3
- Richard's *Répertoire des Bibliothèques et des Catalogues de Manuscrits Grecs*, 69
- Richter's *Roman Portraits*, 75
- Rivista di Filologia Classica* summarized (XXVII 3-4), 78, (XXVIII 1), 164
- Robertson (A. S.) on Milne's *Finds of Greek Coins in the British Isles*, 77; on Hill's *'Barbarous Radiates', Imitations of Third Century Roman Coins*, 159
- Robertson (D. S.) on Turyn's *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, 16
- Robinson's *America in Greece*, 76
- Rodenwaldt's *Köpfe von den Südmetopen des Parthenon*, 37
- Roman and Hellenic Societies, joint meeting with Classical Association 1951, 81
- Rome, early political organization of, 157
- Rose (H. J.) *Obliquio rivo*, 12; on Reinhardt's *Aischylos als Regisseur und Theologe*, 104; on Fletcher's *Notes to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, 105; on Festugière's *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (II), 117; on Thomson's *Studies in Ancient Greek Society: the Prehistoric Aegean*, 127; on Adrados's *El sistema gentílico decimal de los Indoeuropeos occidentales y los orígenes de Roma*, 157; on Brelich's *Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom*, 157; on Usener's *Götternamen (dritte unveränderte Auflage)*, 160; on Edsman's *Ignis Divinus*, 160
- Ross's *Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics*, 114
- Rouse (W. H. D.), *Appreciation of*, 42
- Rüegg's *Kunst und Menschlichkeit Homers*, 32
- Ruteni, economy and history of, 158
- Ruysschaert's *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite*, 120
- Santa-Olalla's *Esquema Paleontológico de la Península Hispánica* (2a edición), 158
- satura, associations of, 56
- Scipio Africanus, political designs of, 132
- Scullard (H. H.) on Meyer's *Römischer Staat und Staatsgedanke*, 31; on Marmorale's *Cato maior and della Corte's Catone Censore, la Vita e la Fortuna*, 132
- Sedgwick's *Of Irony, Especially in Drama*, 102
- Seltman (C.) on Kleiner's *Alexanders Reichsmünzen*, 66
- Seltman's *Masterpieces of Greek Coinage*, 149
- Setton's *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388*, 163
- Severyn's *Homère III; L'Artiste*, 72
- Shear (T. L.), *Commemorative Studies in honor of*, 142
- Sherwin-White (A. N.) on van den Bruwaene's *Le Miracle grec*, 131
- Simon's *Verus Israel*, 30
- Sizoo's *S. Awerli Augustini Enchiridion, De Catechizandis Rudibus*, 156
- Skemp (J. B.) on Untersteiner's *Sofisti, Testimonianze e Frammenti, Fasc. I*, 153
- Sleeman (J. H.) on Janáček's *Prolegomena to Sextus Empiricus*, 73
- Solmsen's *Hesiod and Aeschylus*, 100
- 'sophists' in early Greek communities, 8
- Spain, classical studies in the seminaries of, 42
- Stanford (W. B.) on Kakridis's *Homeric Researches*, 99
- Stanford's *The Odyssey of Homer* (II), 33
- Stillwell's *Corinth. Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. XV, Part I: The Pottery Quarter*, 147
- Stoic tenets concerning *vita* and *aetas*, 90
- Stolte's *De Cosmographie van den Anonymus Ravenas*, 156
- Strömberg's *On Some Greek Proverbial Phrases and Griechiska Ordspråk*, 154
- Strzelecki's *Studia prosodiaca et metrica*, 155

Stubbings (F. H.) on Kosmopoulos's *The Prehistoric Inhabitation of Corinth* (I), 75
 Sutherland (C. H. V.) on Alföldi's *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, 140
 Symbolae Osloenses summarized (XXVII), 78

Tate (J.) on Goldschmidt's *Les Dialogues de Platon: Structure et Méthode dialectique* and *Le Paradigme dans la Dialectique platonicienne*, 20; on Kotting-Menko's *Individu en Kosmos*, 33; on Long's *A Study of the Doctrine of Metempsychosis in Greece from Pythagoras to Plato*, 34; on Raven's *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*, 109; on de Vries's *Spel bij Plato*, 111; on Delatte's *La Constitution des États-unis et les Pythagoriciens*, 153; on Strömberg's *On Some Greek Proverbial Phrases and Grekiska Ordsprak*, 154

Taylor's *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*, 134

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, 81

Thoma (H.) The Oldest Manuscript of Iuvencus, 95

Thomas (I.) on Lejeune's *Euclide et Ptolémée*, 23

Thompson (E. A.) Julian's knowledge of Latin, 51 [167]

Thompson's (D. B.) *Swans and Amber*, 163

Thomson (J. A. K.) Catullus iv 6-9: 90

Thomson (J. O.) on Stolte's *De Cosmographie van den Anonymus Ravennas*, 156

Thomson's (G.) *Studies in Ancient Greek Society: the Prehistoric Aegean*, 127

Thomson's (H. J.) *Prudentius* (I), 119

Tod's *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (II), 27

Toynbee (J. M. C.) on Richter's *Roman Portraits*, 75

trepidare, 13

triarii used for a naval squadron, 10

tribes, Roman, strengths of city and country voters

in, 134

tribute lists, Athenian, 63

Troy, double name of, 97

Turyn's *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, 16

Untersteiner's *Sofisti, Testimonianze e Frammenti, Fasc. I*, 153

Usener's *Götternamen* (dritte unveränderte Auflage), 160

van den Brink's *Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani libros de Praescriptione Haereticorum, adversus Praxean*, 74; his *S. Caecilius Cypriani Scripta Quaedam*, 156
 van den Bruwaene's *Le Miracle grec*, 131
 van der Valk's *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey*, 54
 Verdenius and Waszink's *Aristotle: On Coming-to-be and Passing-away. Some Comments*, 154

Walbank (F. W.) *Naval Triarii*, 10

Warner's *Xenophon, the Persian Expedition*, 154

Waszink's *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima*, 123

Way (J. A. H.) on Mattingly's *Tacitus on Britain and Germany*, 156

Webster (T. B. L.) on della Valle's *Menandro, I Contendenti*, 152

Weinreich's *Römische Satiren*, 55

Whatmough's *Dialects of Ancient Gaul*, publication of documentary section of, 42

Whittick (G. C.) on Bardonn's *Quinte-Curce: Histoires*, 56; on Legrand's *Hérodote, Histoires, Livre VI*, 73

Woodward (A. M.) on Friedländer's *Epiigrammata*, 17; on Raubitschek's *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*, 144

Wycherley's *How the Greeks built Cities*, 159

Young (D. C. C.) on Carrière's *Théognis: Poèmes Élégiques*, 14; on Richard's *Répertoire des Bibliothèques et des Catalogues de Manuscrits Grecs*, 69

II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place.

Aeschines iii 154: 48 f.

Ammianus Marcellinus xiv 1 9: 51; xiv 5 8: 95; xvi

5 7: 51; xvi 5 10, xvii 11 1: 52; xxii 16 14, 16: 95

Anthologia Palatina xii 5 1-2, xii 244: 88; xii 165:

89

Apollonius Rhodius i 395: 5; i 540 ff.: 4

Aratus *Phaen.* 345 ff.: 3, 5

Aristophanes *Ach.* 63: 6; 73-4: 5; 496-556: 6. *Av.*

870: 6. *Ec.* 170-240: 6. *Eq.* 99: 7. *Nu.* 566-7: 7.

Pax 400-27: 7; 603-48: 6. *V.* 143: 6. fr. 26 Dem.: 7

Aristotle *EN* 1177^b5, 17 f.: 12. *Met.* 981^b21: 12.

Mele. 363^b29: 90. *Pol.* 1337^b30 f.: 12

Arrian *Epict.* ii 19 13: 92

Athenaeus 229 e-f, 251 a-b: 5; 397c, 424a: 6

Auctor ad Herennium ii 20 33 Marx: 93

Aulus Gellius vi 3 50: 93

Ausonius i 2 4 Peiper: 93

Caesar *BG* i 42: 11; iv 17 9: 13

Catullus iv 6-9: 90; xciii: 89

Cicero *Att.* xiii 21 3: 3. *Fin.* iii 46: 92. *Phil.* ii 41: 89.

Tusc. v 104: 92. *Verr.* II v 4: 93

Claudian *Rapt. Pros.* i 171-2: 95; iii 159-60: 13

Columella vii 2 4: 89

Constantius *Or.* ii 77d: 53

Cratinus fr. 187 Kock: 7

Demosthenes viii 62: 48 f.; xiv 2, 6, xv 9: 6; xix 95:

48 f.; xix 277, xxiii 200: 6; xlvi 1, 2: 83; lv 20, 21,

22, 29: 46 ff.

Dio xlviii 12 3: 11; lxviii 3 3: 11

Diodorus Siculus i 53 1, 81: 12

Diogenes Laertius vii 102, 189: 92

Dionysius Halicarnassensis *AR* ii 7: 157

Euripides *Andr.* 204: 7. *Ba.* 241: 94. *El.* 688: 94;

726-42: 95; 1023: 94. *Hec.* 500: 94. *IT* 193-4: 95;

445, 1043: 4; 1349-51: 5; 1390-7: 4. *Med.* 30, 398:

94. *Or.* 901, 953: 94. fr. 775 N². 33-4 i = 773 N².

35-6]: 3

Eutropius x 16 3: 51

Galen ii 82: 95

Hell. Oxy. 2 2: 6

Herodotus i 31, 59, 199: 11; ii 109: 12; iv 46, v 16,

vii 83, vii 187: 11; viii 57-8: 9; ix 24, ix 39: 11

Hesiod *Op.* passim: 82 ff.; *Op.* 765 ff.: 5

Homer *Il.* i 432 ff.: 3, ix 527 ff.: 99; xviii 497 ff.: 83;

xxii 25 ff.: 100; xxiii 573 ff.: 86. *Od.* ii 414 ff., iv

360 ff.: 4; viii 585-6: 100; ix 73: 3; ix 180, ix 564,

xi 640, xiii 78, xiii 115: 4; xiii 279: 3; xv 286 ff.: 4;

xv 496: 3; xix 395-6: 86

Horace C. ii 3 11-12: 12

Hymn. Hom. iv 312, 379 ff.: 86

Isocrates iv 145, 179, v 88, viii 98, xii 106, 162: 6;

xv 313: 10

Julian *Ep. ad Ath.* 284d: 53; *Ep.* 8, 9: 52; *Misop.*

352a-b: 52

Juvencus ii 441-2, 462-3: 95 f.

Libanius *Or.* i 97, xviii 21: 52

Lucan i 220, iv 117, iv 223-4: 13; vi 294-5: 95; ix

566-8: 90 ff.

Lucian xlvii 8: 48 f.

Lucretius i 425, 448, ii 381, 677, iii 310-22: 94 f.; iii

868: 93; iv 384, 460: 95; iv 1160: 89; iv 1259: 93

Lycurgus in *Leocratem* 83-9, 94-7: 84

- Lysias ii 42, 59: 7
 Marcus Antoninus iii 11 1: 95
 Marianus frag. p. 384 Baer.: 89
 Martial i 43 13, 14, ii 14 14-18: 53; vii 88 9: 92
 Menander 241 K.: 3
 Ovid *Am.* ii 2 23: 13; ii 4 39-44, iii 7 23: 88 f. *A.A.* ii 657, iii 189, 191: 89. *Her.* vi 87: 13. *Met.* xi 474-5: 4. *R.Am.* 327: 89
POxy. 936 20: 95
 Persius i 122: 92
 Phaedrus iii 15 10: 89
 Philo *De gig.* 2 7-8, *De plant.* 3 12, *De somn.* i 22. 135: 95
 Philostratus *Im.* 2 30 2: 94
 Pindar *I.* v 28: 9. *P.* iv 202: 5
 Plato *Chrm.* 158a: 6. *Men.* 86e: 48 ff.; 92a: 10. *Mx.* 245c-246a: 7. *Phd.* 76e: 45; 106e, 107b: 43. *Prt.* 312c, 316d-317b: 9. *R.* 502a, 509c: 48 ff. *Smp.* 208a-b, 210a-b, 212a: 43 ff.; 222d: 48
 Plato Comicus frags. (Kock) 24: 7; 119: 5; 120, 122, 124: 6; 183: 7. fr. 1 Dem.: 7
 Pliny *NH* ii 47 120: 90
 Pliny *Ep.* ix 13 8: 93
 Plutarch *Mar.* 13: 11. *Pel.* 30: 5. *Them.* 2 3-4: 9; 32 2-3: 7. *Vit. X Or.* 832b-c: 10. *Comm. Not.* 8 (1061f): 92; 37 (1078c): 95
 Polybius i 22, 26, vi 21 7, 33 8-10, 35 12, 36 5, viii 4 2, 11: 11
 Propertius ii 25 41: 88 f.
 Sappho fr. 91 Bergk: 53
 Seneca *Agam.* 20: 13. *Ep.* 49 10, 73 13, 93 2, 99 12 92. *NQ* iv 2 15: 13. *Phaedr.* 510 ff.: 13
 Sophocles *El.* passim: 87 f. fr. 23 Dindorf: 48 ff.
 Statius *Theb.* xi 467: 92
 Stobaeus ii 57 18 Wachsmuth: 92; ii 129 19-20 Wachsmuth: 95
 Strabo xvi 2 24: 12
 Sulpicius Severus *Dial.* i 27: 52
 Tacitus *A.* i 23 4, 41 3: 11
 Terentianus Maurus 165, 2117: 93
 Theophrastus *Sign.* 2 10 f.: 90
 Thucydides i 138: 9; iii 24: 11; iii 41: 4
 Valerius Flaccus i 484: 13
 Virgil *Aen.* iii 577: 95; iv 121: 13; v 629: 13; vi 896: 156. *G.* iii 389: 89; iv 19: 13
 Vopiscus *Aurel.* 6 2: 11
 Xenophon *An.* vii 8 3: 48. *HG* iii 5 1: 6; iv 6 13: 48 ff.; vi 2 29: 4. *Mem.* iv 2 2: 9

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἀγκαθεν, 106
 ἀδιάφορα, 92 ff.
 ἀθανασία, 43 ff.
 ἄκορος, 5
 ἀλέξανδρος, 97
 ἀμυχθαλέους, 69
 ἀνάμνησις, 22, 45
 γέννησις, 44
 γίγας, 106
 διαφέρειν, 94, 138

δίκη, 87, 126
 δι' ὧν and ἐξ ὧν, 95
 εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο, 48 ff.
 ζεύγη, 11
 θέμις, 126
 θρακίας, θρασκίας, 90
 κάρα (loosely used for δέρη), 94
 κρι, 68

κύμνδης, 98
 λύκος, 68
 μέλας, μελάγχρους, 89
 μελίχρους, μελιχρώδης, 89
 ξανθός, 89
 παιπάλλω, 69
 παρηΐς (loosely used for δέρη), 94
 προέρεσαν, 3

πρυμνήσια, 4
 πρυμνήσια, 4
 σοφιστής, 8 ff.
 σοφία, σοφός, 8 ff.
 συκοφαντία, 47 f.
 τόκος, 44
 ὑποζύγια, 11
 ὑποχωρεῖν, 5
 χαλκίς, 98



The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. † W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.
† E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.
L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—Times Literary Supplement.

NEW VOLUMES, 1951

LATIN

371 PLINY, NATURAL HISTORY. Ten volumes. Vol. V (Books XVII-XIX). Translated by H. Rackham.

GREEK

384 DIODORUS SICULUS. Twelve volumes. Vol. V (Books XII. 41-XIII). Translated by C. H. Oldfather.

385 DIO CHRYSOSTOM. Five volumes. Vol. V (Discourses LXI-LXXX). Translated by H. Lamar Crosby.

388 DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS. Seven volumes. Vol. VII (Book XI and Excerpts of Books XII-XX). Translated by Ernest Cary.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

BOOKS AND READERS IN ANCIENT GREECE AND ROME

By SIR FREDERIC G. KENYON

Second edition, 1951. 8s. 6d. net

In this book Sir Frederic Kenyon discusses in turn the origins of reading and the growth of the habit in the Greek world; the appearance and methods of manufacture of books down to the third century A.D.; the reading habits of the Roman world; and finally the change in book production methods in the early Christian era, the adoption of vellum as a material and the replacement of the roll by the modern book form, and the transition from the ancient world to the Middle Ages. In this edition a number of additions have been made, the most important of which is that which relates to the recent discoveries at Oxyrhynchus, both British and Italian, and the early Biblical papyri. Also the opportunity has been taken to make a few corrections and to bring the bibliographical details up to date.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

HEFFER'S of Cambridge BOOKSELLERS

are always glad to offer for
small or large collections of
books relating to *Classical
Antiquity*: Cambridge An-
cient History, Loeb Library,
Foreign Books, Teubner
and Weidmann publica-
tions, &c., &c.

W. HEFFER & Sons Ltd
CAMBRIDGE ENGLAND

Theocritus

EDITED BY

A. S. F. GOW

This important work consists of a text and translation of Theocritus with a long detailed commentary and is issued in two volumes. Mr Gow's work was begun in 1933 and has occupied his leisure since then. There is a full bibliography and there are also 15 plates illustrating the archaeological evidence to which the editor refers.

63s. net

Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome

CH. WIRSZUBSKI

This latest addition to the series of Cambridge Classical studies describes the meaning of *libertas* as a political idea at Rome during the two-hundred-odd years between the Gracchi and Trajan, a period in which the Republican constitution gradually gave way and was finally superseded by the Principate which, in its turn, changed considerably in the first century A.D.

15s. net

Roman Anniversary Issues

MICHAEL GRANT

Professor Michael Grant here pursues further his aim, begun with *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, of bringing the coinages of Rome into closer relation with historical studies. The sub-title of this volume is 'An Exploratory Study of the Numismatic and Medalllic Commemoration of Anniversary Years, 49 B.C.—A.D. 375'.

21s. net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

